Construction Notice for the Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project

PUCO Case No. 23-1133-EL-BNR

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

Submitted by:
Ohio Power Company

December 18, 2023

Construction Notice

Ohio Power Company
Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project

4906-6-05

Ohio Power Company (the "Company") provides the following information in accordance with the requirements of Ohio Administrative Code Section 4906-6-05.

4906-6-5(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 Construction Notice.

The Company is proposing the Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project (the "Project"), in Franklin and Licking Counties, Ohio. The Project involves the installation of 0.9 miles of a double circuit 138 kV greenfield transmission line between Anguin Station and a proposed customer step down, distribution station. The Project will require a 100-foot right-of-way (ROW) and will be located entirely on customer- or Company-owned property. The Project will support the customer's development in the area.

Figures 1 and 2, included in **Appendix A,** show the location of the Project in relation to the surrounding vicinity.

The Project meets the requirements for a Construction Notice (CN) because it is within the types of projects defined by item 1(d)(i) of Ohio Administrative Code Section 4906-1-01 Appendix A of the 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 attact or meet the requirements of a specific customer or customers, as follows:*
>
> > *(i) The line is completely on property owned by the specific customer or the applicant.*

The Project has been assigned PUCO Case No. 23-1133-EL-BNR.

B(2) Statement of Need

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

An existing customer near the Company's Anguin Station has requested three new 138 kV delivery points, NBY-5A and NBY-6A, to serve three new facilities requiring an aggregate of 296 MW of additional load in New Albany, Ohio. The Company is requesting approval of three separately filed construction notices.

This application concerns facilities required to meet the customer's request for the NBY-6A delivery. The Company will be required to construct a greenfield 0.9-mile double circuit 138 kV transmission line, on customer property, extending from the Anguin Station to the customer's step-down station.

The 0.9-mile double circuit 138 kV transmission line will connect the Company's existing Anguin Station to the customer's step-down station (NBY-6A).

The customer has requested an in-service date of July 31, 2024 for NBY-6A. Failure to move forward with the proposed project will result in the inability to serve the customer's load expectations and thereby jeopardize the customer's plans in the New Albany area.

The need and solution for the Project components NBY-5A and NBY-6A were presented and reviewed with stakeholders at the April 21, 2023 PJM SRRTEP meeting and May 9, 2023 PJM TEAC meeting, as seen in **Appendix B**. The Project was inadvertently not included in the Company's 2023 Long Term Forecast Report ("LTFR") but will be included in the Company's 2024 LTFR

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 and proposed transmission lines and substations is shown on **Figure 1**.

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.

Due to the location of the existing Anguin Station, surrounding wetland/stream conservation easements, and the customer's development, no other alternatives were considered for the Project. Any other alternative would add additional length to the Project without any additional benefit. This proposed route is located within the customer's parcels, which have undergone recent industrial development. Furthermore, there are no known impacts to cultural resources areas or streams. The Project will require temporary impacts to two wetlands, due to equipment crossing during construction, and 0.002-acre of permanent wetland impact for the installation of one concrete foundation. The Project will also require less

than 0.1-acre of forested clearing, whereas other crossings and/or routes would likely require clearing of larger forested tracks located west of Anguin Station. Additionally, a large wetland complex and conservation easement surrounds the northern and western extents of the Anguin Station and commercial/industrial developments towards the east. Any route towards the west or north would result in additional wetland disturbances and mitigation for the project, while an eastern route would conflict with development of future grid modifications or future development by others. Additionally, no residences are located within 1,000 feet of the Project. Therefore, this Project represents the most suitable location and is the most appropriate solution for meeting the Company and customer's needs in the area.

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 will be located entirely within Company- or customer-owned property, with no additional property owners or tenants affected. The Company maintains a website (http://aeptransmission.com/ohio/) on which an electronic copy of this CN is available. An electronic copy of the CN will be served to the public library in each political subdivision affected by this Project.

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 anticipated to begin in March 2024, and the anticipated in-service date is July 2024.

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.

Figure 1 provides the proposed Project area and existing transmission facilities on a map of 1:24,000-scale (1-inch equals 2,000 feet), showing the Project on a topographic map of the New Albany quadrangle provided by the National Geographic Society. **Figure 2** shows the Project area on recent aerial photography, dated 2021, as provided by the Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), at a scale of 1:6,000 (1-inch equals 500 feet).

To visit the Project site from Columbus, Ohio, take I-670 East for approximately six miles and then merge onto I-270 N toward Cleveland. Continue on I-270 for approximately two miles, then take Exit 30 New Albany/OH 161E. Continue on OH 161E for 11 miles and then take the Beech Road NW exit. Turn right onto Beech Road and continue for approximately 1.5 miles and turn right onto Blacklick Creek Road. The approximate address of the Project site is 1101 Beech Road SW, at latitude 40.059659°, longitude -82.766711°,

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 list of properties required for the Project is provided in the table below. The Company has entered into a right of entry agreement with the customer.

Property Parcel Number	Agreement Type	Easement or Option Obtained (Yes/No)
094-106896-00.000	Customer Owned	Yes
222-004984-00.000	Customer Owned	Yes
094-106404-00.002	Company Owned	N/A

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.

Voltage: 138 kV
Conductors: Double Circuit, (2-bundle) 795 kcmil 26/7 ACSS (Drake)
Static Wire: (1) 96 ct OPGW and (1) 7#8 Alumoweld
Insulators: Polymer
ROW Width: 100-foot
Structure Types: Six (6) 2-pole steel self-supporting dead-end structures on concrete pier foundations, and (6) mono-pole steel direct embedded tangent structures.

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.

No occupied residences or institutions are located within 100 feet of the Project.

B(9)(c) Project Cost

The estimated capital cost of the project.

The capital cost estimate for the proposed Project, which is comprised of applicable tangible and capital costs, is approximately $4,275,000 from a Class 4 estimate. Forty percent (40%) of the costs for one circuit and one hundred percent (100%) of the second circuit costs of will be recovered through reimbursement from the customer. Pursuant to the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT"), the

remainder of the costs for this Project will be recovered in the Company's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") formula rate (Attachment H-14 to the PJM OATT) and allocated to the AEP Zone.

B(10) Social and Economic Impacts

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

B(10)(a) Land Use 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.

An aerial photograph of the Project vicinity is provided as **Figure 2**. The Project location has undergone significant land use changes over the past several years, from heavy agriculture to light commercial and industrial use. The Project is located in the City of New Albany in both Jersey Township, Licking County, and Plain Township, Franklin County, Ohio. There are no parks, churches, cemeteries, wildlife management areas, or nature preserve lands within 1,000 feet of the Project. The two parcels crossed by the Project are zoned "General Employment," by the City of New Albany.

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 Licking County Auditor provided a list of parcels registered as Agricultural District Land on October 30, 2023 and on December 7, 2023, confirmed that no changes to the previously provided list has occurred. Additionally, the Franklin County Auditor provided a list of parcels registered as Agricultural District Land on October 30, 2023 and on December 12, 2023, confirmed that no changes to the previously provided list has occurred.

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.

Phase I Archaeological investigations and History/Architecture Investigations for the Project occurred in August 2023. No archaeological sites or architectural resources of 50 years of age or older were identified within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). On August 30, 2023, the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office ("SHPO") concurred with the recommendations and stated that the Project will have no effect on historic properties and no further investigations or consultation with SHPO is necessary. Coordination with SHPO is provided as **Appendix C.**

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 storm water discharges under General Permit OHC000006. The Company will also coordinate storm water permitting needs with local government agencies, as necessary. The Company will implement and maintain best management practices as outlined in the Project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to minimize erosion and control sediment to protect surface water quality during storm events.

The Company's consultant conducted a stream and wetland delineation within the Project study area. Seven wetlands, one perennial stream, one intermittent stream and four ponds were identified within the Project study area, additional details regarding the delineated features are provided in Section (10) (f) below. One stream will be crossed by utilizing temporary timber mat bridge. Additionally, one PEM wetland is proposed for temporary timber matting activities and one concrete foundation is proposed to be installed for the Project. Due to the avoidance of the stream's ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) and each wetland crossing is less than 0.10-acre, regulatory authorization from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is not warranted as further clarified in **Section (10)(f)**.

No FEMA regulated floodplains or floodways will be disturbed by the Project as identified in FEMA Map ID#39089C0267H provided as **Appendix E**.

There are no other known local, state, or federal requirements that must be met prior to commencement of the proposed Project.

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.

On August 1, 2023, coordination letters were sent to United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) Ohio Natural heritage Program (ONHP) and Division of Wildlife (DOW), seeking an environmental review for the Project for potential impacts to threatened and endangered species. Responses were received from the USFWS on August 11, 2023, and from the ODNR on September 1, 2023. According to a response letter received from the USFWS, due to the project, type, size, and location, adverse effects to federally endangered, threatened, or proposed species or proposed designated critical habitat is not anticipated. Regarding state threatened and endangered species that may occur within the Project vicinity, 27 species were listed by the ODNR. A species review for each of these species and potential impacts from the Project were evaluated and a summary provided below.

Of the 27 listed species, four bat species northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentroinalis*), Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalist*), little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*), tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*) were identified as being within range of the Project area and ODNR request adherence to seasonal tree clearing activities (October 1 to March 31). Based on general observations during the ecological survey, the existing landuse is landscape or urban areas and only one portion of the Project along Rhoades Ditch is proposed for forested clearing (approximately 0.26-acres). Anticipated tree clearing for the Project is proposed to occur within the recommended seasonal tree clearing recommendations (between October 1 and March 31) as effort to avoid adverse effects to these listed bat species. Additionally, the Company's consultant completed a desktop review for potential hibernaculum within 0.25 miles of the Project area and no caves, mines, and/or karst features were identified. As per ODNR/USFWS guidance, further coordination regarding potential hibernaculum is only necessary if the habitat assessment find potential habitat within 0.25 miles of the Project area. Therefore, no further coordination was necessary with either the ODNR and/or USFWS regarding these species. Results of the desktop habitat assessment has been included within **Appendix E**.

Additionally, the ODNR identified several aquatic species including fish and mussels within range of the Project area. These species include Goldeye (*Hiodon alosoides*), Iowa darter (*Etheostoma exile*), Lake chubsucker *(Erimyzon sucetta*), Northern brook lamprey (*Ichthyomyzon fossor*), Paddlefish (Po*lyodon spathula*), Popeye shiner (*Notropis ariommus*), Shortnose gar (*Lepisosteus platostomus*), Spotted darter (*Etheostoma maculatum*), Tonguetied minnow (*Exoglossum laurae*), Clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*), Elephant-ear (*Elliptio crassidens crassidens*), Long solid (*Fusconaia maculata maculate*), Northern riffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*), Ohio pigtoe (*Pleurobema cordatum*), Pocketbook (La*mpsilis ovata*), Pondhorn (*Uniomerus tetralasmus*), Purple cat's paw (*Epioblasma o. obliquata*), Rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*), Rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*), Salamander Mussel (*Simpsonaias ambigua*), Snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*), and Washboard (*Megalonaias nervosa*). No impacts are anticipated to any fish and/or mussel species as no in-water work is proposed as part of the Project. Therefore, no further coordination with the ODNR was warranted.

Lastly, the ODNR commented that the Project is within range of one bird species, Northern harrier (*Circus hudsonis*). Based on existing site conditions, potential nesting habitat for the Northern Harrier was not identified due to the commercial and industrial development of the area. As per the ODNR initial guidance provided in **Appendix C**, this species is not likely to be impacted by the Project if their habitat will not be impacted. Therefore, no further coordination regarding Northern Harrier was warranted regarding this Project as no habitat was present.

A copy of the agency correspondence is provided in **Appendix C**. Additional information regarding habitat assessments within the Project area is provided within the Wetland Delineation and Stream Assessment Report found in **Appendix D**.

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.

The Company's consultant prepared an ecological survey report which is provided in **Appendix D**. The survey of the Project area identified seven palustrine emergent (PEM) wetlands. Additionally, two streams (one intermittent and one perennial) and four ponds were identified within the Project area. The Company anticipates temporary timber matting to be required for equipment access and permanent disturbance from installation of one structure within one PEM wetland as well as and one temporary bridge across one stream. Regarding the temporary timber matting bridge across the stream, no disturbance will occur to the stream due to installation of the temporary timber mat bridge above the ordinary highwater mark (OHWM). Additionally, the one temporary wetland crossing will result in less than 0.10 acres of fill. Therefore, the Project is compliant with non-reporting conditions of the Nationwide Permit 57 for automatic Section 404/401 authorization. No other streams, ponds, and/or wetlands will be impacted by this Project.

Coordination letters were submitted to the USFWS and ODNR requesting a review the Project and identification of areas of ecological concern. The USFWS's response email was received on August 11, 2023, (**Appendix C**) and did not indicate any federal wilderness areas, wildlife refuges, or designated critical habitat within the vicinity of the Project. The ODNR's response received on September 1, 2023 (**Appendix C**) did not indicate any known unique ecological sites, geologic features, scenic rivers, state wildlife areas, state natural preserves, state or national parks, state or national forests, national wildlife refuges, or other protected natural areas within the Project area.

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 Figures



Data Sources: AEP, USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangles (New Albany)

Coordinate System and Datum: NAD 83 State Plane Ohio South, Feet

December 15, 2023

FIGURE 1
TOPOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

AEP OHIO

Construction Notice
Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5
Transmission Line Project

0 1,000 2,000 3,000 4,000
Feet



- Station
- Proposed Anguin Ext No.5 Transmission Line
- Proposed Anguin Ext. No.1 Rockhopper 138kV Transmission Line (Filed Seperately: Case No. 23-0343-EL-BNR)
- Proposed Anguin Extension No 2 (Filed Separately: Case No. 23-0631-EL-BLN)
- Proposed Anguin Extension No 3 (Filed Separately: Case No. 23-0631-EL-BLN)
- Proposed Anguin-Brie 138kV Transmission Line (Filed Seperately: Case No. 22-1029-EL-BLN)
- Existing Transmission Line
- Parcel Boundary

Data Sources: AEP
& ESRI Imagery, 2021

Coordinate System
and Datum:
NAD 83 State Plane
Ohio South, Feet

December 15, 2023

FIGURE 2
AERIAL MAP

AEP OHIO
An AEP Company

Construction Notice
Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5
Transmission Line Project

0 500 1,000
Feet



Station
Proposed Anguin Ext No.5 Transmission Line
Proposed Anguin Ext. No.1 Rockhopper 138kV Transmission Line (Filed Seperately: Case No. 23-0343-EL-BNR)
Proposed Anguin-Brie 138kV Transmission Line (Filed Seperately: Case No. 22-1029-EL-BLN)
Proposed Anguin 138kV Extension No. 1 (Filed Separately: Case No. 22-1029-EL-BLN)
Existing Transmission Line
Parcel Boundary

Data Sources: AEP & ESRI Imagery, 2021

Coordinate System and Datum:
NAD 83 State Plane Ohio South, Feet

December 15, 2023

FIGURE 2
AERIAL MAP

AEP OHIO
An AEP Company

Construction Notice
Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5
Transmission Line Project

0 500 1,000
Feet

Appendix B PJM Solution

Need Number: AEP-2023-OH063

Process Stage: Solutions Meeting 5/9/2023

Previously Presented: Needs Meeting 4/21/2023

Project Driver: Customer Service

Specific Assumption Reference:

AEP Connection Requirements for the AEP Transmission System (AEP Assumptions Slide 12)

Problem Statement:

- An existing customer served out of AEP's Anguin Station in New Albany, OH, has requested an additional service for a new bulk load addition of 100 MW. This will bring the total load for the customers site to 550 MW with an ultimate capacity of up to 720 MW.
- Customer requested in-service date of 7/31/2024.



Need Number: AEP-2023-OH063

Process Stage: Solutions Meeting 5/9/2023

Proposed Solution (continued):

The following work is all direct connect facilities to physically connect demand to the grid.

- **Anguin – NBY-6A 138 kV**: Install (3) 138 kV, 4000A, 80 kA circuit breakers and construct a new greenfield ~0.9 miles double circuit line to customer's new NBY-6A station. Cost: **$6.92 M**

Appendix C Agency Correspondence

In reply, refer to
2023-FRA-58911

August 30, 2023

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

RE: Anguin Extension 5 NBY6A Extension TLE Project, Plain Township, Franklin County and Jersey Township, Licking County, Ohio

Dear Mr. Weller:

This letter is in response to the correspondence received August 28, 2023 regarding the proposed Anguin Extension 5 NBY6A Extension TLE Project, Plain Township, Franklin County and Jersey Township, Licking County, 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 Cultural Resource Management Investigations for the Approximately 1.9 km (1.2 mile) Anguin Extension 5 NBY6A Extension TLE Project, Plain Township, Franklin County, and Jersey Township, Licking County, Ohio* by Seth T. Cooper (Weller & Associates, Inc. 2023).

A literature review was completed as part of the investigations. No previously identified archaeological resources are located within the project area. No archaeological survey is needed as the project area is highly disturbed from active construction activities or has already been surveyed. No architectural resources were located within the Area of Potential Effects (APE).

Based on the information provided, we agree the project as proposed will have no 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. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Krista Horrocks, Project Reviews Manager
Resource Protection and Review

RPR Serial No: 1099586

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

September 1, 2023

Joshua Holmes
AECOM
707 Grant Street, 5th Floor
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Re: 23-0898; Anguin 138kV Extension No.5 Transmission Line Project

Project: The proposed project involves building a 0.97-mile greenfield double circuit 138 kV transmission line from the existing Anguin Station to the future proposed customer station (Penguin NBY7A).

Location: The proposed project is located in Plain Township of Franklin County, and Jersey Township of 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 project 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 the 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. However, these species are also dependent on the forest structure surrounding roost trees. 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.

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.

The project is within the range of the following listed mussel species.
Federally Endangered
clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*)
rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*)
northern rifffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*)
snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*)
purple cat's paw (*Epioblasma o. obliquata*)

Federally Threatened
rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*)

State Endangered
elephant-ear (*Elliptio crassidens crassidens*)
pocketbook (*Lampsilis ovata*)
long solid (*Fusconaia maculata maculate*)
washboard (*Megalonaias nervosa*)
Ohio pigtoe (*Pleurobema cordatum*)

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

Due to the location, and that there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream, this project is not likely to impact these species.

The project is within the range of the following listed fish species.
State Endangered
goldeye (*Hiodon alosoides*)
shortnose gar (*Lepisosteus platostomus*)
Iowa darter (*Etheostoma exile*)
spotted darter (*Etheostoma maculatum*)
northern brook lamprey (*Ichthyomyzon fossor*)
tonguetied minnow (*Exoglossum laurae*)
popeye shiner (*Notropis ariommus*)

State Threatened
lake chubsucker (*Erimyzon sucetta*)
paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*)

Due to the location, and that there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream, this project is not likely to impact these 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

August 11, 2023

Project Code: 2023-0110261

Dear Mr. Joshua Holmes:

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,

Patrice Ashfield
Field Office Supervisor

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

Appendix D Ecological Resources Inventory Report

ANGUIN 138kV EXTENSION NO.5 TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT

FRANKLIN AND LICKING COUNTIES, 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 #: 60714942 & 60714957

September 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 4
2.0 METHODOLOGY 4
2.1 WETLAND DELINEATION 5
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 6
2.2.2 OEPA 401 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION FOR NATIONWIDE PERMIT ELIGIBILITY 6
2.2.3 UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURES 7
2.3 RARE, THREATENED, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES 7
3.0 RESULTS 8
3.1 WETLAND DELINEATION 8
3.1.1 PRELIMINARY SOILS EVALUATION 8
3.1.2 NATIONAL WETLAND INVENTORY MAP REVIEW 9
3.1.3 DELINEATED WETLANDS 9
3.2 STREAM DELINEATION 11
3.2.1 OEPA STREAM ELIGIBILITY 11
3.2.2 FEMA 100 YEAR FLOODPLAINS 11
3.3 PONDS 13
3.4 UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURES 13
3.5 VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES 13
3.6 RARE, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES AGENCY COORDINATION 14
4.0 SUMMARY 19
5.0 REFERENCES 21

TABLES (in-text)

Table 1 - SOIL MAP UNITS AND DESCRIPTIONS WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA 8
Table 2 - NWI DISPOSITION SUMMARY TABLE WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA 9
Table 3 - SUMMARY OF DELINEATED WETLANDS WITHIN THE PROECT SURVEY AREA 12
Table 4 - SUMMARY OF DELINEATED STREAMS 15
Table 5 - VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA 15
Table 6 - ODNR AND USFWS LISTED SPECIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA 15

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

APPENDICES

Number

APPENDIX A Agency Correspondence
APPENDIX B Desktop Assessment for Winter Bat Habitat
APPENDIX C U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Determination Data Forms / OEPA Wetland ORAM Forms / Delineated Features Photographs (combined per wetland and shown in numerical order)
APPENDIX D OEPA Stream Data Forms / Delineated Features Photographs
APPENDIX E Pond Photographic Record
APPENDIX F Upland Drainage Feature Photographic Record
APPENDIX G Habitat Photographic Record

1.0 INTRODUCTION

American Electric Power Ohio Transmission Company (AEP Ohio Transco) is proposing the construction of a new 0.97-mile, greenfield 138 kilovolt (kV) transmission line from the existing Anguin Station to the future proposed customer station, as part of the Anguin 138 kV Extension No.5 Transmission Line Project (Project) in Franklin and Licking Counties, Ohio. The survey area associated with this Ecological Report is located within the New Albany, United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographical quadrangle as displayed on the Project Topographic Overview Map (**Figure 1**).

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

2.0 METHODOLOGY

The field survey was completed for a 150-foot-wide corridor along the proposed transmission line centerline and 50-foot-wide corridor centered on proposed temporary access roads as well as the extent of extra work spaces, totaling an approximately 22.1-acre Project survey area. Prior to conducting field surveys, digital United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey data, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) data, USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), Federal 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 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 *Regional 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: Projects 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. Projects 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 an RTE species review and general field habitat survey 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. Responses were received on September 8, 2023, and August 18, 2023, respectively (**Appendix A)**. 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 RTE 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 **Appendix B**. 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

On March 10th, 2022, May 10th and 11th, 2022, October 13th, 2022, and August 15, 2023, AECOM ecologists walked the Project survey area to conduct the wetland delineation, stream assessment and habitat survey. Within the Project survey area, AECOM delineated seven PEM wetlands, four ponds and two streams (one perennial and one intermittent). The representative wetland and stream data forms as well as photo documentation are provided as **Appendix C and D,** respectively.

3.1 WETLAND DELINEATION

3.1.1 PRELIMINARY SOILS EVALUATION

According to the USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey, eight soil map units are mapped within the Project survey area (USDA NRCS, 2023a and 2023b). Of these, three were identified as hydric soil, and five were identified 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 (%)
Bennington	BeA	Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Ground moraines	Yes*	Condit 5% Pewamo 3%
	BeB	Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Ground moraines	Yes*	Condit 3% Pewamo 3%
Centerburg	Cen1B1	Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Drainageways	Yes*	Condit 4% Marengo 3%
	Cen1B2	Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes, eroded	Ground moraines	Yes*	Marengo 3%
	Cen1C2	Centerburg silt loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, eroded	Drainageways	Yes*	Condit 4%
Pewamo	Pe	Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Depressions and Toe slopes	Yes	Pewamo 85% Condit 9%
	Pm	Pewamo silt loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Depressions and Toe slopes	Yes	Sloan 8%

Soil Series	Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Topographic Setting	Hydric	Hydric Component (%)
Sloan	So	Sloan silt loam, Columbus lowland, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded	Flood Plains	Yes	Sloan 85%

NA = Not Applicable or Not Available; Yes* = Hydric inclusion present

3.1.2 NATIONAL WETLAND INVENTORY MAP REVIEW

According to NWI data covering the Project location, the Project survey area crosses three mapped NWI features as identified on **Figure 2** and detailed within **Table 2** below.

TABLE 2 - NWI DISPOSITION SUMMARY TABLE WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

NWI Code	NWI Description	Related Field Inventoried Resource (Wetland ID/Stream ID)	Comments
PEM1A	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Temporary Flooded	None	NWI mapped boundary was identified in an area of active development from commercial/industrial area and was not present within study area.
R4SBC	Riverine, Intermittent, Streambed, Seasonally Flooded	S-CMS-002	Field verified as perennial stream S-CMS-002
PUBGx	Palustrine, Unconsolidated Bottom, Intermittently Flooded, Excavated	None	NWI mapped wetland is located within the gravel pad of the existing Anguin Station.

3.1.3 DELINEATED WETLANDS

The Project survey area contains seven PEM wetlands assigned as ORAM Category 1. No Category 2 or 3 wetlands were identified within the Project survey area. The AECOM delineation boundaries are provided on **Figures 2 and 3**.

AECOM has given all wetlands within the Project survey area a provisional determination of jurisdictional (non-isolated i.e., WOTUS). 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**. Details for each delineated wetland in the Project survey area are provided in **Table 3**. Completed USACE Data Form and photographs of the delineated wetlands are provided in **Appendix C.**

TABLE 3 – SUMMARY OF DELINEATED WETLANDS WITHIN THE PROECT 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-CMS-001	40.06584	-82.76516	No	PEM	0.24	15	1	1	None	None	None	0	0
W-CMS-002	40.06535	-82.76563	No	PEM	0.62	18	1	2	None	2	Concrete Foundation	0.056	0.002
W-CMS-003	40.061245	-82.756309	No	PEM	0.316	21.0	1	None	None	None	None	0	0
W-MRK-001	40.06482	-82.76684	No	PEM	0.23	18	1	2	None	None	None	0	0
W-MRK-002	40.06321	-82.76843	No	PEM	0.93	15	1	4	None	None	None	0	0
W-MRK-003	40.05571	-82.76458	No	PEM	0.12	11	1	14	None	None	None	0.001	0
W-MRK-004	40.05565	-82.76393	No	PEM	0.20	11	1	15	None	None	None	0.019	0
P-CMS-001	40.06445	-82.76488	-	-	7.03	-	-	3	None	None	None	0	0
P-CMS-002	40.060863	-82.756054	*	*	0.091	-	-	None	None	None	None	0	0
P-MRK-001	40.06594	-82.76630	*	*	0.55	-	-	1	None	None	None	0	0
P-MRK-002	40.05582	-82.76674	-	-	0.15	-	-	12B	None	None	None	0	0
Total:					**10.48**							**0.076**	**0.002**

3.2 STREAM DELINEATION

AECOM identified one perennial stream and one intermittent stream within the Project survey area (**Figure 3)**. A summary of the delineated features is provided below in **Table 4**. Stream data forms and photographs of the delineated stream resource are provided in **Appendix D**.

AECOM has provided a provisional determination that 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**.

3.2.1 OEPA STREAM ELIGIBILITY

OEPA stream eligibility for 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) mapping was reviewed for the Project survey area. The Project occurs within one watershed, Headwaters of Blacklick Creek (HUC-12 050600011503) that is designated as Possibly Eligible for 401 WQC, OEPA stream eligibility mapping for the Project vicinity is provided on **Figure 4**.

3.2.2 FEMA 100 YEAR FLOODPLAINS

Mapped FEMA designated 100-year floodplains and floodways are displayed on **Figure 2**. No regulated FEMA 100-year floodplains and/or floodways are located within the Project survey area (FEMA, 2007).

TABLE 4 - SUMMARY OF DELINEATED STREAMS

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-CMS-002	40.06563	-82.76502	Perennial	UNT to Blacklick Creek	395	22	22	QHEI	42	Poor	Possibly Eligible	No	None	0
S-CMS-003	40.061247	-82.756826	Intermittent	UNT to Blacklick Creek	236	3	3	HHEI	28	Modified Class 1 PHW	Possibly Eligible	Air Bridge	None	0
				Total:	**631**									**0**

3.3 PONDS

During the field surveys, AECOM identified four ponds within the Project survey area. A summary of ponds identified within the Project survey area is provided in **Table 3** and photographs of each feature is provided within **Appendix E**.

3.4 UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURES

During the field survey, six UDFs were identified within the Project survey area. The extents of the UDFs are displayed on **Figures 2 and 3** and photographs provided within **Appendix F**.

3.5 VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES

AECOM ecologists conducted a general habitat survey in conjunction with the stream and wetland field surveys. A variety of woody and herbaceous lands, as described in **Table 5**, below, are present within the Project survey area, including landscaped area, old field, streams/wetlands, and urban land. Habitat descriptions applicable to the Project are provided below. 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 G**.

TABLE 5 - VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

Vegetative Community	Description	Approximate Acreage Within the Project Survey Area	Approximate Percentage Within the Project Survey Area
Landscaped Area	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.	14.3	64.7%
Old Field	Grassland and/or herbaceous cover alongside roads, field borders, and abandoned fields, as the initial stages of recolonization by plants following disturbance, and are infrequently mowed areas dominated by grasses, forbs, and occasional woody species. 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.	1.0	4.4%
Streams/Wetlands	Streams and wetlands were observed both within and beyond the survey area for the Project	2.1	9.3%
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.	4.8	21.6%
	Totals:	**22.1**	**100%**

3.6 RARE, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES AGENCY COORDINATION

Protected Species Agency Consultation –

On August 1, 2023, coordination letters were sent to USFWS and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) Ohio Natural heritage Program (ONHP) and Division of Wildlife (DOW), seeking an environmental review for the Project for potential impacts to RTE species.

Responses were received from the USFWS on August 11, 2023, and from the ODNR on September 1, 2023. According to the response letter received from the USFWS, two federally endangered and one federally proposed bat species were identified within range of the Project area. Regarding state threatened and endangered species that may occur within the Project vicinity, 27 species were listed by the ODNR.

Correspondence letters from the USFWS and ODNR for the Project are included as **Appendix A**. **Table 6** 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 G.**

Table 6 - 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, bat species roost in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, these species hibernate in humid mines, caves, and occasionally.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey area, the existing land use is composed of existing commercial/industrial development that lacks the presence of forested areas or suitable bat roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No Mines 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. 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 No impact to listed bat species or their habitat is anticipated due to absence of tree clearing activities. If tree clearing is required, it should be completed between October 1 and March 31. 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, bat species roost in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, these species hibernate in humid mines, caves, and occasionally man-made structures.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey area, the existing land use is composed of existing commercial/industrial development that lacks the presence of forested areas or suitable bat roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No Mines 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. 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 No impact to listed bat species or their habitat is anticipated due to absence of tree clearing activities. If tree clearing is required, it should be completed between October 1 and March 31. 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, bat species roost in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, these species hibernate in humid mines, caves, and occasionally man-made structures.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey area, the existing land use is composed of existing commercial/industrial development that lacks the presence of forested areas or suitable bat roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No Mines 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. 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 No impact to listed bat species or their habitat is anticipated due to absence of tree clearing activities. If tree clearing is required, it should be completed between October 1 and March 31. Hibernaculum(a) No impacts to winter hibernacula were identified due to absence of caves, mines, or portals within 0.25-miles of the Project.

Common Name (Scientific Name)	State Status	Federal Status	Typical Habitat	Habitat Observed	Avoidance Dates	Agency Comments	Potential Impacts
Tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*)	Endangered	Proposed Endangered	Summer habitat During spring/summer, bat species roost in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, these species hibernate in humid mines, caves, and occasionally man-made structures.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey area, the existing land use is composed of existing commercial/industrial development that lacks the presence of forested areas or suitable bat roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No Mines 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. 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 No impact to listed bat species or their habitat is anticipated due to absence of tree clearing activities. If tree clearing is required, it should be completed between October 1 and March 31. Hibernaculum(a) No impacts to winter hibernacula were identified due to absence of caves, mines, or portals within 0.25-miles of the Project.
Fish							
Goldeye (*Hiodon alosoides*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No rivers present.	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Iowa darter (*Etheostoma exile*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No natural lakes present.	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Lake chubsucker (*Erimyzon sucetta*)	Threatened	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No lakes, ponds, swamps or streams were identified in the Project survey area	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Northern brook lamprey (*Ichthyomyzon fossor*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No streams are present but are too small, are of marginal quality and/or lack microhabitat features.	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No

Common Name (Scientific Name)	State Status	Federal Status	Typical Habitat	Habitat Observed	Avoidance Dates	Agency Comments	Potential Impacts
Paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*)	Threatened	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No rivers present.	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Popeye shiner (*Notropis ariommus*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No streams are present but are too small, are of marginal quality and/or lack microhabitat features	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Shortnose gar (*Lepisosteus platostomus*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No rivers present.	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Spotted darter (*Etheostoma maculatum*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	No streams are present but are too small, are of marginal quality and/or lack microhabitat features.	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Tonguetied minnow (*Exoglossum laurae*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams or Waterbodies	The Project is outside the Great Miami and Little Miami River system.	March 15 – 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 this or other aquatic species.	No
Mussels							
Clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*)	Endangered	Endangered	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Elephant-ear (*Elliptio crassidens crassidens*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Long solid (*Fusconaia maculata maculate*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Northern riffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*)	Endangered	Endangered	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Ohio pigtoe (*Pleurobema cordatum*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No

Common Name (Scientific Name)	State Status	Federal Status	Typical Habitat	Habitat Observed	Avoidance Dates	Agency Comments	Potential Impacts
Pocketbook (*Lampsilis ovata*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Pondhorn (*Uniomerus tetralasmus*)	Threatened	None	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Purple cat's paw (*Epioblasma o. obliquata*)	Endangered	Endangered	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*)	Threatened	Threatened	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*)	Endangered	Endangered	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Salamander Mussel (*Simpsonaias ambigua*)	Threatened	None	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*)	Endangered	Endangered	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Washboard (*Megalonaias nervosa*)	Endangered	None	Perennial Streams	No perennial stream of sufficient size.	N/A	Due to the location, and there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream of sufficient size, this Project is not likely to impact this species.	No
Birds							
Northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*)	Endangered	None	This species hunts over grasslands and nests can be found in large marshes and grasslands.	The potential for nesting habitat for the Northern Harrier was absent based on field/desktop review of the project area. The absence of habitat was due to the extensive disturbance to the surrounding area where grading and other construction activities are taking place as well as fragmented habitat thus lacking contiguous habitat.	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

*2023 Joint Guidance – Refers to the 2023 ODNR DOW and USFWS Joint Guidance for Bat Surveys and Tree Clearing, a copy of the guidance is provided within this report.

Protected Species Agency Summary –

Based on general observations during the ecological survey, no forested habitat is present within the Project survey area, and thus no tree clearing is proposed as part of the Project. If tree clearing were to become part of the Project scope of work, the ODNR/USFWS recommends 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. If trees must be cut during the summer months, the ODNR recommends that a mist net survey could be completed for 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 area for the Northern long-eared bat. If summer tree clearing is needed, additional coordination would be completed with ODNR/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 (2023 Joint Guidance; **Appendix A**) within 0.25 miles of the Project area and no caves, mines, and/or karst features were identified. As per ODNR/USFWS guidance, further coordination regarding potential hibernaculum is only necessary if the habitat assessment find potential habitat within 0.25 miles of the Project area. Therefore, no further coordination was necessary with either the ODNR and/or USFWS regarding the listed bat species. Results of the desktop habitat assessment have been included within **Appendix B**.

No impacts are anticipated for any of the aquatic listed species and no in-water work is proposed as part of the Project or species habitat is present. Additionally, the potential for nesting habitat for the Northern Harrier was absent based on field/desktop review of the Project survey area. The absence of habitat was due to the extensive commercial and industrial development of the property that created a lack of old field, wet meadows, or grass land habitat. Therefore, no further coordination regarding this listed species is necessary for the Project.

4.0 SUMMARY

Ecological surveys of the Project survey area identified seven wetlands, one perennial stream, one intermittent stream and four ponds. The wetlands within the Project survey area were all PEM wetlands and were categorized as Category 1 wetlands. The perennial stream was assigned a QHEI score of 42 and a narrative rating of poor. The intermittent stream was assigned an HHEI score of 28 and is classified as a Modified Class 1 PHW stream. The four ponds in the Project survey area are constructed and maintained stormwater detention ponds. AECOM has preliminary determined that the assessed stream and wetlands 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 in **Figure 3**. Areas that fall outside of the Project survey area were not evaluated in the field and not included in the reporting of the survey.

Of the 27 state and/or federal listed threatened or endangered species within range of the Project survey area, four bat species were identified as not having summer roosting habitat and no potential hibernacula was identified within the Project Survey Area. If tree clearing is identified as being required as part of this Project, the ODNR and USFWS recommends completing seasonal tree clearing activities between October 1 to March 31.

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. 2018. National Flood Hazard Layer, Licking & Franklin County, Ohio. https://msc.fema.gov/portal Published July 22, 2018.

Kollmorgen Corporation. 2010. Munsell Soil Color Charts. Baltimore, Maryland.

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). 2022. Joint Guidance for Bat Surveys and Tree Clearing. Published May 2022.

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 August 2023.

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

APPENDIX A

AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

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.

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

September 1, 2023

Joshua Holmes
AECOM
707 Grant Street, 5th Floor
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Re: 23-0898; Anguin 138kV Extension No.5 Transmission Line Project

Project: The proposed project involves building a 0.97-mile greenfield double circuit 138 kV transmission line from the existing Anguin Station to the future proposed customer station (Penguin NBY7A).

Location: The proposed project is located in Plain Township of Franklin County, and Jersey Township of 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 project 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 the 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. However, these species are also dependent on the forest structure surrounding roost trees. 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.

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.

The project is within the range of the following listed mussel species.
Federally Endangered
clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*)
rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*)
northern rifffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*)
snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*)
purple cat's paw (*Epioblasma o. obliquata*)

Federally Threatened
rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*)

State Endangered
elephant-ear (*Elliptio crassidens crassidens*)
pocketbook (*Lampsilis ovata*)
long solid (*Fusconaia maculata maculate*)
washboard (*Megalonaias nervosa*)
Ohio pigtoe (*Pleurobema cordatum*)

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

Due to the location, and that there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream, this project is not likely to impact these species.

The project is within the range of the following listed fish species.
State Endangered
goldeye (*Hiodon alosoides*)
shortnose gar (*Lepisosteus platostomus*)
Iowa darter (*Etheostoma exile*)
spotted darter (*Etheostoma maculatum*)
northern brook lamprey (*Ichthyomyzon fossor*)
tonguetied minnow (*Exoglossum laurae*)
popeye shiner (*Notropis ariommus*)

State Threatened
lake chubsucker (*Erimyzon sucetta*)
paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*)

Due to the location, and that there is no in-water work proposed in a perennial stream, this project is not likely to impact these 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

August 11, 2023

Project Code: 2023-0110261

Dear Mr. Joshua Holmes:

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,

Patrice Ashfield
Field Office Supervisor

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

APPENDIX B

DESKTOP ASSESSMENT FOR WINTER BAT HABITAT

American Electric Power
8600 Smith's Mill RoadNew
Albany, OH 43054;
ajtoohey@ aep.com

August 1, 2023

Attention: Mr. John Kessler
Ohio Department of Natural Resources
2045 Morse Road, Building E-2
Columbus, Ohio 43229-6693

Via email: environmentalreviewrequest@dnr.state.oh.us; NHDRequest@dnr.state.oh.us

Reference: Anguin 138kV Extension No.5 Transmission Line Project, Franklin and Licking Counties, Ohio

Dear Mr. Kessler:
AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc. (AEP), is formally requesting that the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) is requesting an Environmental Review and Natural Heritage Database Request for the proposed Anguin 138kV Extension No.5 Transmission Line Project (Project) located in Franklin and Licking Counties, Ohio (OH).The Project consists of building a new 0.97-miles, greenfield 138kV transmission line from the existing Anguin Station to the future proposed customer station located in Franklin and Licking Counties, Ohio. The Project is located on New Albany, Ohio U.S. Geologic Survey 7.5' topographical quadrangle as displayed on the Project Topographic Overview Map (Figure 1).

AECOM completed a desktop review of publicly available data to identify underground voids which could be potential hibernation sites for overwintering bats (hibernacula) within 0.25-miles of the Project area. The data sources utilized include USGS topographical maps, aerial photography, and ODNR's Division of Mineral Resources and Geological Survey Data for Known Mining Activity and Karst Geology/Sinkholes as shown on Figure 1 and 2. Based on the available desktop resources, there are no underground and historic surface mines as well as karst features located within 0.25-mile of the Project. Therefore, potential hibernacula is not anticipated to occur within range of the Project area.

Please provide us with the results of the ODNR's environmental review, including results of the ODNR Natural Heritage Database search, at your earliest convenience. If you have questions or need additional information regarding the Project, please contact me at the phone number or email below. Thank you for your assistance with this request.

Sincerely,

Brian Miller
Project Manager VIII
Phone: (412-667-9172); brian.miller@aecom.com

CC: Amy J. Toohey
Environmental Specialist-Consultant
Phone: (614-565-1480); ajtoohey@aep.com

Attachments: Figure 1 – Topographic Project Overview; Figure 2 – Aerial Project Overview; Natural Heritage Data Request Form; Electronic Shapefiles(.shp)

No mining activities, karst features, and/or sink holes are within the extent of the map frame. The closest feature is 2.37 miles northwest of the project area.

40.066573
-82.765744

40.055754
-82.767301

40.055555
-82.763454

Legend

- Anguin 138kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line
- Quater Mile Review Boundary
- Ohio USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle
- County Boundary

N

0 800 1,600

Feet

Anguin 138kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project

FIGURE 1
TOPOGRAPHIC PROJECT OVERVIEW

DATE: 7/31/2023	1 INCH = 800 FEET
CREATED BY: CJT	CHECKED BY: JH
JOB NO.: 60713340	AECOM

Date Saved: 7/31/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60713340_AEP_Anguin138kV_ExtNo5\2_MXDs\0_TEI\Anguin_138kV_Ext_No5_ODNRFigure1_Topo_Overview.mxd

No mining activities, karst features, and/or sink holes are within the extent of the map frame. The closest feature is 2.37 miles northwest of the project area.

40.066573
-82.765744

40.055754
-82.767301

40.055555
-82.763454

FRANKLIN COUNTY

LICKING COUNTY

New Albany

Jersey

Legend

- Anguin 138kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line
- Quater Mile Review Boundary
- Ohio USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle
- County Boundary

N

0 800 1,600

Feet

AEP

Anguin 138kV Extension No. 5
Transmission Line Project

FIGURE 2
AERIAL PROJECT OVERVIEW

DATE: 7/31/2023	1 INCH = 800 FEET
CREATED BY: CJT	CHECKED BY: JH
JOB NO.: 60713340	AECOM

Date Saved: 7/31/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60713340_AEP_Anguin138kV_ExtNo5\2_MXDs\0_TEVAnguin_138kV_Ext_No5_ODNRFigure2_Aerial_Overview.mxd

APPENDIX C

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORMS

OEPA WETLAND ORAM FORMS

DELINEATED FEATURES PHOTOGRAPHS (WETLANDS)

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 5/10/2022

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: W-CMS-001

Investigator(s): CMS, HA Section, Township, Range: 2N 15W S16

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

Slope (%): 3 Lat: 40.06584 Long: -82.765169 Datum: NAD 83

Soil Map Unit Name: So: Sloan silt loam, Columbus Lowland, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded NWI classification: NA

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

Are Vegetation x , Soil x , or Hydrology x significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ____ No X

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 X	No ____	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** **Yes** X **No** ____
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X	No ____	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X	No ____	

Remarks:
Area has been used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted. Compaction prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology, previous vegetation has been removed. Wetland is dominated by reed canary grass. The sample point is representative of a PEM wetland.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')			
1. *Phalaris arundinacea*	40	Yes	FACW
2. *Euthamia graminifolia*	25	Yes	FACW
3. *Valerianella chenopodiifolia*	15	No	FAC
4. *Allium canadense*	15	No	FACU
5. *Rosa multiflora*	10	No	FACU
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
	105 =Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')			
1.			
2.			
	=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	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	65	x 2 =	130
FAC species	15	x 3 =	45
FACU species	25	x 4 =	100
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	105 (A)		275 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.62

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

____ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation

X 2 - Dominance Test is >50%

X 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** X **No** ____

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

SOIL

Sampling Point: W-CMS-001

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

Depth	Matrix		Redox Features					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-4	10YR 3/2	60	7.5YR 4/6	5	C	M	Loamy/Clayey	Prominent redox concentrations
	10YR 6/2	35						
4-14	10YR 3/1	70	7.5YR 4/6	5	C	M	Loamy/Clayey	Prominent redox concentrations
	10YR 6/2	20						

[1]Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked 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 Mucky Mineral (S1)
- ___ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ___ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ___ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ___ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ___ Dark Surface (S7)
- ___ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ___ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ___ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- X Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ___ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ? Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils[3]:

- ? Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ___ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- ___ Red Parent Material (F21)
- ___ Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- ___ 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** X **No** ___

Remarks:

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- ___ Surface Water (A1)
- X High Water Table (A2)
- X 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)
- X Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- X 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)

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

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present?	Yes ___	No X	Depth (inches): ___
Water Table Present?	Yes X	No ___	Depth (inches): 10
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes X	No ___	Depth (inches): 0

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** X **No** ___

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

Remarks:

Precipitation provides hydrology. Area floods regulary by adjacent stream.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 5/10/2022

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: W-CMS-001-UPL

Investigator(s): CMS, HA Section, Township, Range: 2N 15W S16

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

Slope (%): 7 Lat: 40.065793 Long: -82.764984 Datum: NAD 83

Soil Map Unit Name: So: Sloan silt loam, Columbus Lowland, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded NWI classification: NA

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

Are Vegetation x , Soil x , or Hydrology x significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ____ No X

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 X	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** **Yes** ____ **No** X
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ____	No X	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ____	No X	

Remarks:
Area used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted. Compaction prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology. The sample point is representative of the uplands that surround W-CSM-001

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')			
1. *Rosa multiflora*	30	Yes	FACU
2. *Lonicera canadensis*	15	Yes	FACU
3.			
4.			
5.			
	45 =Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')			
1. *Viola blanda*	30	Yes	FACW
2. *Euthamia graminifolia*	20	Yes	FACW
3. *Valerianella chenopodiifolia*	15	No	FAC
4. *Allium canadense*	10	No	FACU
5. *Rosa multiflora*	10	No	FACU
6. *Dipsacus fullonum*	5	No	FACU
7. *Cryptotaenia canadensis*	5	No	FAC
8. *Veronica persica*	2	No	UPL
9.			
10.			
	97 =Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')			
1.			
2.			
	=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	50	x 2 =	100
FAC species	20	x 3 =	60
FACU species	70	x 4 =	280
UPL species	2	x 5 =	10
Column Totals:	142 (A)		450 (B)
Prevalence Index = B/A =			3.17

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** X

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

SOIL

Sampling Point: -CMS-001-UI

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

Depth	Matrix		Redox Features					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-14	10YR 4/1	100					Loamy/Clayey	

[1]Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked 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 Mucky Mineral (S1)
- ___ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ___ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ___ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ___ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ___ Dark Surface (S7)
- ___ 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)
- ___ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- ___ Red Parent Material (F21)
- ___ Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- ___ 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** X

Remarks:

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

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)
- X Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ___ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present?	Yes ___	No X	Depth (inches): ___
Water Table Present?	Yes ___	No X	Depth (inches): ___
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes ___	No X	Depth (inches): ___

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ___ **No** X

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

Remarks:

One secondary wetland hydrology is present. Wetland hydrology criteria not met.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 5/10/2022

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: W-CMS-002

Investigator(s): CMS, HA Section, Township, Range: S16 2N 15W

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

Slope (%): 3 Lat: 40.065355 Long: -82.765663 Datum: NAD 83

Soil Map Unit Name: So: Sloan silt loam, Columbus Lowland, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded NWI classification: NA

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

Are Vegetation x , Soil x , or Hydrology x significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ____ No X

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 X	No ____	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** **Yes** X **No** ____
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X	No ____	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X	No ____	

Remarks:
This sample point is representative of a PEM wetland. The area has been used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted. Compaction prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology, vegetation has been modified. Wetland is dominated by reed canary grass.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')			
1. *Phalaris arundinacea*	20	Yes	FACW
2. *Euthamia graminifolia*	15	Yes	FACW
3. *Trifolium repens*	15	Yes	FACU
4. *Poa palustris*	5	No	FACW
5. *Rosa multiflora*	5	No	FACU
6. *Erigeron philadelphicus*	3	No	FACW
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
	63 =Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')			
1.			
2.			
	=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	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	43	x 2 =	86
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	20	x 4 =	80
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	63 (A)		166 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.63

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

____ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation

X 2 - Dominance Test is >50%

X 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** X **No** ____

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
A preponderance of hydrophytic vegeation is present

SOIL

Sampling Point: W-CMS-002

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

Depth	Matrix		Redox Features					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-3	10YR 3/2	80	10YR 5/4	20	c	m	Loamy/Clayey	Distinct redox concentrations
3-9	10YR 3/1	45	10YR 5/4	10	c	m	Loamy/Clayey	Distinct redox concentrations
	10YR 3/2	45						

[1]Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked 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 Mucky Mineral (S1)
- ___ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ___ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ___ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ___ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ___ Dark Surface (S7)
- ___ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ___ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ___ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- X Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ___ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ___ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils[3]:

- ___ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ___ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- ___ Red Parent Material (F21)
- ___ Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- ___ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: Gravel

Depth (inches): 9

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** X **No** ___

Remarks:

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- ___ Surface Water (A1)
- ___ High Water Table (A2)
- X 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)
- X Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- X 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)

- X Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ___ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ___ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ___ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ___ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- X Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- X Geomorphic Position (D2)
- X 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 X	No ___	Depth (inches): 4

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** X **No** ___

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

Remarks:

Precipitation provides hydrology. Area flooded regularly by adjacent stream.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 5/10/2022

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: W-CMS-002-UPL

Investigator(s): CMS, HA Section, Township, Range: S16 2N 15W

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

Slope (%): 7 Lat: 40.065344 Long: -82.765421 Datum: NAD 83

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 x No ____ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation x , Soil x , or Hydrology x significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ____ No X

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 X	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** **Yes** ____ **No** X
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ____	No X	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ____	No X	

Remarks:
This sample point is representative of the uplands that surround W-CMS-002. Area used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted. Compaction prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology, vegetation has been modified.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')			
1. *Phalaris arundinacea*	20	Yes	FACW
2. *Taraxacum officinale*	20	Yes	FACU
3. *Trifolium repens*	20	Yes	FACU
4. *Trifolium repens*	20	Yes	FACU
5. *Euthamia graminifolia*	10	No	FACW
6. *Ranunculus acris*	5	No	FAC
7. *Packera aurea*	5	No	FACW
8.			
9.			
10.			
	100 =Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')			
1.			
2.			
	=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: 4 (B)

Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 25.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	35	x 2 =	70
FAC species	5	x 3 =	15
FACU species	60	x 4 =	240
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	100 (A)		325 (B)
Prevalence Index = B/A =			3.25

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** X

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
A preponderance of hydrophytic vegeatation is not present.

SOIL

Sampling Point: -CMS-002-UI

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

Depth	Matrix		Redox Features					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-3	10YR 3/2	70	10YR 3/4	30	c	m	Loamy/Clayey	Distinct redox concentrations
3-8	10YR 3/2	100					Loamy/Clayey	

[1]Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked 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 Mucky Mineral (S1)
- ___ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ___ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ___ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ___ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ___ Dark Surface (S7)
- ___ 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)
- ___ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- ___ Red Parent Material (F21)
- ___ Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- ___ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: Gravel

Depth (inches): 8

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ___ **No** X

Remarks:

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

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 X Depth (inches): ___

Water Table Present? Yes ___ No X Depth (inches): ___

Saturation Present? Yes ___ No X Depth (inches): ___

(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ___ **No** X

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

Remarks:

Wetland hydrology not present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 5/10/2022

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: W-CMS-003

Investigator(s): CMS, HA Section, Township, Range: S25 2N 15W

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

Slope (%): 2 Lat: 40.061164 Long: -82.75579 Datum: NAD 83

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 x No ____ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation x , Soil x , or Hydrology x significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ____ No X

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 X	No ____	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** **Yes** X **No** ____
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X	No ____	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X	No ____	

Remarks:
This sample point is representavite of a PEM wetland located in an area used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted and affects hydrology, vegetation has been disturbed. Wetland is dominated by flat topped goldenrod.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')			
1. *Euthamia graminifolia*	40	Yes	FACW
2. *Carex lurida*	25	Yes	OBL
3. *Phalaris arundinacea*	20	No	FACW
4. *Trifolium repens*	10	No	FACU
5. *Packera aurea*	5	No	FACW
6. *Taraxacum officinale*	5	No	FACU
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
	105 =Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')			
1.			
2.			
	=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	65	x 2 =	130
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	15	x 4 =	60
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	105 (A)		215 (B)
Prevalence Index = B/A =			2.05

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

___ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation

X 2 - Dominance Test is >50%

X 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** X **No** ____

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

SOIL

Sampling Point: W-CMS-003

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

Depth	Matrix		Redox Features					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-8	10YR 4/1	90	10YR 4/6	10	c	m	Loamy/Clayey	Prominent redox concentrations
8-12	10YR 4/1	70	10YR 4/6	30	c	m	Loamy/Clayey	Prominent redox concentrations

[1]Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked 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 Mucky Mineral (S1)
- ___ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ___ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ___ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ___ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ___ Dark Surface (S7)
- ___ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ___ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- X Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ___ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ___ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ? Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils[3]:

- ? Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ___ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- ___ Red Parent Material (F21)
- ___ Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- ___ 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** X **No** ___

Remarks:

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

Gravel refusal at 12 inches.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- X Surface Water (A1)
- X High Water Table (A2)
- X 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)
- X Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- X 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)

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

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present?	Yes X	No ___	Depth (inches): 0.5
Water Table Present?	Yes X	No ___	Depth (inches): 0
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes X	No ___	Depth (inches): 0

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** X **No** ___

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

Remarks:

Precipitation provides hydrology. Area recieves hydrology from runoff from adjacent pond.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 5/10/2022

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: W-CMS-003-UPL

Investigator(s): CMS, HA Section, Township, Range: S25 2N 15W

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

Slope (%): 5 Lat: 40.061105 Long: -82.755581 Datum: NAD 83

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 x No ____ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation x , Soil x , or Hydrology x significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ____ No X

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 X	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ____ No X
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X	No ____	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ____	No X	

Remarks:
Representative of the upland areas that surround W-CMS-003. Area used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted and prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology, vegetation has been disturbed.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
	=Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')			
1. *Trifolium repens*	50	Yes	FACU
2. *Daucus carota*	20	Yes	UPL
3. *Phalaris arundinacea*	8	No	FACW
4. *Trifolium repens*	5	No	FACU
5. *Plantago major*	5	No	FAC
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
	88 =Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')			
1.			
2.			
	=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	8	x 2 =	16
FAC species	5	x 3 =	15
FACU species	55	x 4 =	220
UPL species	20	x 5 =	100
Column Totals:	88 (A)		351 (B)
Prevalence Index = B/A =			3.99

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 X

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

SOIL

Sampling Point: -CMS-003-UI

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

Depth	Matrix		Redox Features					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-7	10YR 3/2	90	10YR 4/6	10	c	m	Loamy/Clayey	Prominent redox concentrations

[1]Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked 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 Mucky Mineral (S1)
- ___ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ___ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ___ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ___ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ___ Dark Surface (S7)
- ___ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ___ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ___ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- X Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ___ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ___ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils[3]:

- ___ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ___ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- ___ Red Parent Material (F21)
- ___ Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- ___ 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** X **No** ___

Remarks:

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

Multiple attempts to excavate past 7 inches all resulted in gravel refusal.

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)
- X Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ___ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present?	Yes ___	No X	Depth (inches): ___
Water Table Present?	Yes ___	No X	Depth (inches): ___
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes ___	No X	Depth (inches): ___

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ___ **No** X

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

Remarks:

Precipitation provides hydrology. Area recieves hydrology from runoff from adjacent pond.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin Extension No. 1 Rockhopper Project City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 13-Oct-22

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

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH Section, Township, Range: S T R

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

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.064825 Long.: -82.766840 Datum: NAD 83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pm: Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 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 ○	
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉	No ○	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ◉ No ○
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉	No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM wetland is located in a small isolated depression that is collecting surface runoff. The wetland boundary follows edge of depression and hydrophytic vegetation dominated by Echinochloa crus-galli.

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. Echinochloa crusgalli	75	☑ 55.6%	FACU
2. Setaria pumila	25	☐ 18.5%	FAC
3. Carex vulpinoidea	25	☐ 18.5%	FACW
4. Trifolium repens	10	☐ 7.4%	FACU
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	135	= 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	25	x 2 =	50
FAC species	25	x 3 =	75
FACU species	85	x 4 =	340
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	135 (A)		465 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.444

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.)
The vegetation observed had been recently mowed.

*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	3/6	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:

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: Anguin Extension No. 1 Rockhopper Project City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 13-Oct-22

Applicant/Owner: AEP Ohio State: OH Sampling Point: W-MRK-001 UPL

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH Section, Township, Range: S T R

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

Slope: 3.0% / 1.7 ° Lat.: Long.: Datum: NAD 83

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-001. Upland data was collected on top of a pond berm.

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. Poa pratensis	100	☑ 80.0%	FAC
2. Trifolium pratense	20	☐ 16.0%	FACU
3. Setaria pumila	5	☐ 4.0%	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%	
	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	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	105	x 3 =	315
FACU species	20	x 4 =	80
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	125 (A)		395 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.160

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 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	4/3	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: Anguin Extension No. 1 Rockhopper Project City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 13-Oct-22

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

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH Section, Township, Range: S T R

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

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.063210 Long.: -82.768430 Datum: NAD 83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeB: Bennington silt loam, Pm: Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till 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 ○	
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉	No ○	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ◉ No ○
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉	No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM wetland is located within a man-made swale that is draining surface water runoff from the surrounding area. Water drains to a pond that is alos within the survey area. The wetland boundary follows edge of swale.

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	75	☑ 75.0%	OBL
2. Cyperus esculentus	10	☐ 10.0%	FACW
3. Setaria pumila	10	☐ 10.0%	FAC
4. Bidens trichosperma	5	☐ 5.0%	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%	
	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	80	x 1 =	80
FACW species	10	x 2 =	20
FAC species	10	x 3 =	30
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	100 (A)		130 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.300

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	2.5YR	4/2	90	10YR	3/6	10	C	M	Silty Clay	

[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.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin Extension No. 1 Rockhopper Project City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 13-Oct-22

Applicant/Owner: AEP Ohio State: OH Sampling Point: W-MRK-002-UPL

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH Section, Township, Range: S T R

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

Slope: 3.0% / 1.7 ° Lat.: Long.: Datum: NAD 83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeB: Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 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:
Upland data point for W-MRK-002 and W-MRK-003. Upland data was collected on top of a pond berm.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Picea abies	0	☐	0.0%	UPL
2. Quercus rubra	0	☐	0.0%	FACU
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. Trifolium pratense	50	☑	41.7%	FACU
2. Dactylis glomerata	30	☑	25.0%	FACU
3. Setaria pumila	25	☑	20.8%	FAC
4. Taraxacum officinale	10	☐	8.3%	FACU
5. Ambrosia artemisiifolia	5	☐	4.2%	FACU
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: 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	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	25	x 3 =	75
FACU species	95	x 4 =	380
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	120 (A)		455 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.792

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.)
Trees within the area were recently planted.

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

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-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
0-16	10YR	4/3	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: Anguin Ext 5 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 15-Aug-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: **W-MRK-003 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, RBL Section, Township, Range: S T 2N R 15W

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

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.05571 Long.: -82.76458 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:
This PEM wetland is located within a depression surrounded by active construction. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area with drains to a roadside ditch, UDF-MRK-003.

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. Echinochloa crusgalli	80	☑ 59.3%	FACU
2. Typha angustifolia	15	☐ 11.1%	OBL
3. Leersia oryzoides	10	☐ 7.4%	OBL
4. Persicaria pensylvanica	10	☐ 7.4%	FACW
5. Juncus effusus	10	☐ 7.4%	OBL
6. Scirpus cyperinus	10	☐ 7.4%	OBL
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	135	= 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	45	x 1 =	45
FACW species	10	x 2 =	20
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	80	x 4 =	320
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	135 (A)		385 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.852

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 indicator is present as prevalence index is <3.0.

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

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-003 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	10YR	3/6	10	C	M	Clay	

[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): 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 collection within the depression. Several primary and secondary hydrology indicators present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin Ext 5 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 15-Aug-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: **W-MRK-004 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, RBL Section, Township, Range: S T 2N R 15W

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

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.05565 Long.: -82.76393 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:
This PEM wetland is located within a depression surrounded by active construction. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area with drains to a roadside ditch and culvert, UDF-MRK-003.

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. Echinochloa crus-galli	60	☑ 44.4%	FACW
2. Carex vulpinoidea	20	☑ 14.8%	FACW
3. Leersia oryzoides	10	☐ 7.4%	OBL
4. Persicaria pensylvanica	10	☐ 7.4%	FACW
5. Juncus effusus	10	☐ 7.4%	OBL
6. Trifolium pratense	10	☐ 7.4%	FACU
7. Ambrosia artemisiifolia	10	☐ 7.4%	FACU
8. Rumex crispus	5	☐ 3.7%	FAC
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	135	= 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	90	x 2 =	180
FAC species	5	x 3 =	15
FACU species	20	x 4 =	80
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	135 (A)		295 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.185

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-004 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	10YR	3/6	10	C	M	Clay	

[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): 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 collection within the depression. Several primary and secondary indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Anguin Ext 5 City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 15-Aug-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: **W-MRK-003-004 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, RBL Section, Township, Range: S T 2N R 15W

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

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.05578 Long.: -82.76433 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-003 and W-MRK-004. Upland data was collected on a recently regraded property in a construction zone.

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. Trifolium pratense	60	☑ 40.0%	FACU
2. Setaria pumila	20	☑ 13.3%	FAC
3. Ambrosia artemisiifolia	20	☑ 13.3%	FACU
4. Daucus carota	20	☑ 13.3%	UPL
5. Phleum pratense	20	☑ 13.3%	FACU
6. Anthoxanthum odoratum	10	☐ 6.7%	FACU
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
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: 1 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 20.0% (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	110	x 4 =	440
UPL species	20	x 5 =	100
Column Totals:	150 (A)		600 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 4.000

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 indicator is absent.

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

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-003-004 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
0-8	10YR	4/3	95	10YR	5/8	5	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	
8-16	10YR	4/3	60	10YR	5/4	30			Silty Clay Loam	
				10YR	6/8	10	C	M		

[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 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.

Background Information

Name:	Charlotte Stallone
Date:	5/10/2022
Affiliation:	AECOM
Address:	564 White Pond drive, Akron OH 44320
Phone Number:	717-617-7738
e-mail address:	charlotte.stallone@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	W-CMS-001
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	40.06584,-82.765169
USGS Quad Name	New ALbany
County	Licking
Township	New Albany
Section and Subsection	NA
Hydrologic Unit Code	050600011503
Site Visit	5/10/2022
National Wetland Inventory Map	NA
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	
Soil Survey	
Delineation report/map	

Name of Wetland: W-CMS-001	
Wetland Size (acres, hectares): 0.245	

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

N



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

The portion within the study area was found to consist of a PEM community. Area used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted. Compaction prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology, vegetation has been removed. Wetland is dominated by reed canary grass and flat topped goldenrod.

Final score : 15	**Category:** 1

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.

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

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

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	0ak 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 1

Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0	Rater(s): C.Stallone	Date: 5/10/2022

Field Id: **W-CMS-001**

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

1 | 1 (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)

0.245 acres delineated within survey area

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

1 | 2 (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)
- [ ] 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.

11.0 | 13.0 (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)
- [x] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [x] road bed/RR track used as an access rd
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

3 | 16 (max 20 pts. | subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [x] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [x] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

16 (subtotal this page) ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland 1

Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Angu	Rater(s): C.Stallone	Date: 5/10/2022

Field Id:
W-CMS-001

	16
	subtotal this page
0	**16**
max 10 pts.	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)

-1	**15**
max 20pts.	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)
- [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)
- [x] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3) Phalaris arundinacea
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] 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	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

Category 1

15	**GRAND TOTAL(max 100 pts)**

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	1	
	Metric 3. Hydrology	11	
	Metric 4. Habitat	3	
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0	
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	-1	
	TOTAL SCORE	15	Category based on score breakpoints 1

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

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.

Background Information

Name:	Charlotte Stallone
Date:	5/10/2022
Affiliation:	AECOM
Address:	564 White Pond drive, Akron OH 44320
Phone Number:	717-617-7738
e-mail address:	charlotte.stallone@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	W-CMS-002
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	40.065355, -82.765663
USGS Quad Name	New ALbany
County	Licking
Township	New Albany
Section and Subsection	NA
Hydrologic Unit Code	050600011503
Site Visit	5/10/2022
National Wetland Inventory Map	NA
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	
Soil Survey	
Delineation report/map	

Name of Wetland: W-CMS-002	
Wetland Size (acres, hectares): 0.615 acres	

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

N



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

The portion within the study area was found to consist of a PEM community. Area used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted. Compaction prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology, vegetation has been removed. Wetland is dominated by reed canary grass, flat topped goldenrod and white clover.

Final score : 18	**Category:** 1

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.

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

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

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	0ak 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 2

Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0	Rater(s): C.Stallone	Date: 5/10/2022

Field Id: **W-CMS-002**

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2 | 2 (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)
- [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)

0.615 acres delineated within survey area

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

1 | 3 (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)
- [ ] 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.

11.0 | 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)
- [x] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [x] road bed/RR track — used as an access rd and staging area
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

3 | 17 (max 20 pts. | subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] 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
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

17 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland 2

Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Angu	Rater(s): C.Stallone	Date: 5/10/2022

Field Id:
W-CMS-002

17
subtotal this page

0 | 17 **Metric 5. Special Wetlands.**

max 10 pts. | subtotal

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)

1 | 18 **Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.**

max 20pts. | subtotal

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)
- [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)

Phalaris arundinace

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] 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	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

Category 1

18 **GRAND TOTAL(max 100 pts)**

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	11	
	Metric 4. Habitat	3	
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0	
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	1	
	TOTAL SCORE	18	Category based on score breakpoints 1

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

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.

Background Information

Name:	Charlotte Stallone
Date:	5/10/2022
Affiliation:	AECOM
Address:	564 White Pond drive, Akron OH 44320
Phone Number:	717-617-7738
e-mail address:	charlotte.stallone@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	W-CMS-003
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	40.061164, -82.75579
USGS Quad Name	New ALbany
County	Licking
Township	New Albany
Section and Subsection	NA
Hydrologic Unit Code	050600011503
Site Visit	5/10/2022
National Wetland Inventory Map	NA
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	
Soil Survey	
Delineation report/map	

Name of Wetland: W-CMS-003	
Wetland Size (acres, hectares): 0.316 acres	

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

N



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

The portion within the study area was found to consist of a PEM community.Area used as an access for construction of storm water retention pond and substation. Soils have been compacted. Compaction prevents water from percolating properly through the soil and affects hydrology, vegetation has been removed. Wetland is dominated by flat topped goldenrod, reed canary grass, and sallow sedge.

Final score : 21	**Category:** 1

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.

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

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

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	0ak 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 3

Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0	Rater(s): C.Stallone	Date: 5/10/2022

Field Id:
W-CMS-003

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2 | 2 (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)
- [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)

0.316 acres delineated within survey area

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

1 | 3 (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)
- [ ] 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.

14.0 | 17.0 (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)
- [x] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [x] 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.

- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [x] road bed/RR track — used as an access rd and staging area
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

3 | 20 (max 20 pts. | subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [x] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

20 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland 3

Site: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Angu	Rater(s): C.Stallone	Date: 5/10/2022

Field Id:
W-CMS-003

	20 subtotal this page
0	**20** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

max 10 pts.

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)

1	**21** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

max 20pts.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

0	Aquatic bed
1	Emergent
0	Shrub
0	Forest
0	Mudflats
0	Open water
0	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)

Phalaris arundinace

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	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

Category 1

21	**GRAND TOTAL(max 100 pts)**

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	14	
	Metric 4. Habitat	3	
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0	
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	1	
	TOTAL SCORE	21	Category based on score breakpoints 1

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

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 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:	**10/13/2022**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street Floor 5, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-001 PEM**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM**
HGM Class(es):	**Depression**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.

See Figures 1, 2, and 3 of Wetland Delineation and Stream Assessment Report.

Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.064847, -82.766847**
USGS Quad Name:	**Westerville**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Plain Township**
Section and Subsection:	**S16 T2N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**50600011503**
Site Visit:	**10/13/2022**
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 PEM		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.23	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.23

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

Final score:	18	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001 PEM

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 PEM

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 PEM

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 PEM

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 PEM

Site:	Anguin-Rockhopper	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	10/13/2022

Field ID:

W-MRK-001 PEM

Delineated acres:	0.23
Total acres:	

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.

3.0 / 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)
- [ ] 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 / 11.0 (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)
- [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
- [x] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

6.0 / 17.0 (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

- [x] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

17.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001 PEM

Site:	Anguin-Rockhopper	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	10/13/2022

Field ID:

W-MRK-001 PEM

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)

1.0 max 20pts. **18.0** 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)
- [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)
- [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

18.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

1 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001 PEM

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	**3**		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	**7**		
	Metric 4. Habitat	**6**		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	**0**		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	**1**		
	TOTAL SCORE	**18**		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001 PEM

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.

Background Information	
Name:	**MRK, AJH**
Date:	**10/13/2022**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street Floor 5, Pitsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-002 PEM**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM**
HGM Class(es):	**Depression**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.

See Figures 1, 2, and 3 of Wetland Delineation and Stream Assessment Report.

Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.063356, -82.768446**
USGS Quad Name:	**Westerville**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Plain Township**
Section and Subsection:	**S16 T2N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**50600011503**
Site Visit:	**10/13/2022**
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-002 PEM		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.20	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.20

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

Final score:	15	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-002 PEM

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-002 PEM

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-002 PEM

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-002 PEM

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-002 PEM

Site:	Anguin-Rockhopper	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	10/13/2022

Field ID:

W-MRK-002 PEM

Delineated acres:	0.20
Total acres:	

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.

1.0 / 2.0 (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)
- [ ] 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.

8.0 / 10.0 (max 30 pts. / 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)
- [ ] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

[x]	ditch	[ ]	point source (nonstormwater)
[ ]	tile	[x]	filling/grading
[x]	dike	[ ]	road bed/RR track
[ ]	weir	[ ]	dredging
[x]	stormwater input	[ ]	Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

3.0 / 13.0 (max 20 pts. / subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

[x]	mowing	[ ]	shrub/sapling removal
[ ]	grazing	[ ]	herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
[x]	clearcutting	[ ]	sedimentation
[ ]	selective cutting	[ ]	dredging
[ ]	woody debris removal	[ ]	farming
[ ]	toxic pollutants	[ ]	nutrient enrichment

13.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-002 PEM

Site:	Anguin-Rockhopper	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	10/13/2022

Field ID:

W-MRK-002 PEM

13.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **13.0** 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. **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

- [ ] 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)
- [0] 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

15.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

1 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-002 PEM

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	**1**		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	**8**		
	Metric 4. Habitat	**3**		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	**0**		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	**2**		
	TOTAL SCORE	**15**		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-002 PEM

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.

Background Information	
Name:	MRK, RBL
Date:	8/15/2023
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-003, W-MRK-004**
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:	40.05571, -82.76458 and 40.05565, -82.76393
USGS Quad Name:	New Albany
County:	Licking
Township:	2N
Section and Subsection:	15W
Hydrologic Unit Code:	050600011503 - Headwaters Blacklick Creek
Site Visit:	8/15/2023
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-003, W-MRK-004		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.32	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.60

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

PEM wetland is located within a depression surrounded by active construction. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area with drains to a roadside ditch and culvert, UDF-MRK-003.

Final score:	11	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-003, 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-003, 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-003, 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-003, 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-003, W-MRK-004

Site:	AEP Anguin Ext 5	Rater(s):	MRK, RBL	Date:	8/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-003, W-MRK-004 PEM

Delineated acres:	0.32
Total acres:	0.60

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.

5.0 (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)
- [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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] 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.

3.0 (max 20 pts.) | 11.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [x] 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)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [x] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

11.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-003, W-MRK-004

Site:	AEP Anguin Ext 5	Rater(s):	MRK, RBL	Date:	8/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-003, W-MRK-004 PEM

11.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **11.0** 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. **11.0** 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

11.0	**TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**
1	**Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-003, 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	**1**		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	**5**		
	Metric 4. Habitat	**3**		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	**0**		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	**0**		
	TOTAL SCORE	**11**		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-003, 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.

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-001 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing North	

W-CMS-001 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing East	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-001 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing South	

W-CMS-001 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-001	
Date: May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing Soil	

W-CMS-002	
Date: May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-002 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing East	

W-CMS-002 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing South	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-002 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing West	

W-CMS-002 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing Soils	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-003

Date:

May 10, 2022

Description:

PEM wetland

Category 1

Facing North

W-CMS-003

Date:

May 10, 2022

Description:

PEM wetland

Category 1

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-003 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing South	

W-CMS-003 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-CMS-003 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** PEM wetland Category 1 Facing Soils	

W-MRK-001 **Date:** October 13, 2022 **Description:** PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-001

Date:

October 13, 2022

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing West

W-MRK-001

Date:

October 13, 2022

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-001 **Date:** October 13, 2022 **Description:** PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing East	

W-MRK-001 **Date:** October 13, 2022 **Description:** PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing Soil	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-002

Date:

October 13, 2022

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing North

W-MRK-002

Date:

October 13, 2022

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-002 **Date:** October 13, 2022 **Description:** PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing South	

W-MRK-002 **Date:** October 13, 2022 **Description:** PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing East	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-002	
Date: October 13, 2022	
Description: PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing Soil	

W-MRK-003	
Date: August 15, 2023	
Description: PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-003

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing West

W-MRK-003

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-003
Date: August 15, 2023
Description: PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing East

W-MRK-003
Date: August 15, 2023
Description: PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-004 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing North	

W-MRK-004 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** PEM Wetland Category 1 Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-004

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing South

W-MRK-004

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

W-MRK-004

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

PEM Wetland

Category 1

Facing Soil

APPENDIX D

OEPA STREAM DATA FORMS

DELINEATED FEATURES PHOTOGRAPHS (STREAM)

Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index and Use Assessment Field Sheet

OhioEPA

Poor **QHEI Score:** 42

Stream & Location: Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0 **RM:** _ _ _._ **Date:** 5/10/2022

S-CMS-002 **Scorers Full Name & Affiliation:** Charlotte Stallone, AECOM

River Code: _ _ _ - _ _ _ - _ _ _ **STORET #:** _ _ _ _ _ _ **Lat./ Long.:** (NAD 83 - decimal °) 40.065639, -82.765022 **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]	10	90
☐ ☐ BOULDER [9]			☐ ☐ DETRITUS [3]		
☐ ☐ COBBLE [8]			☐ ☐ MUCK [2]		
☐ ☐ GRAVEL [7]			☑ ☐ SILT [2]	90	10
☐ ☐ 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]

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]

QUALITY

SILT
- ☑ HEAVY [-2]
- ☐ MODERATE [-1]
- ☐ NORMAL [0]
- ☐ FREE [1]

EMBEDDEDNESS
- ☑ EXTENSIVE [-2]
- ☐ MODERATE [-1]
- ☐ NORMAL [0]
- ☐ NONE [1]

Comments

Substrate 2 *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]	1 AQUATIC MACROPHYTES [1]
SHALLOWS (IN SLOW WATER) [1]	BOULDERS [1]	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 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 11 *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

L	R	EROSION
☐	☐	NONE / LITTLE [3]
☑	☑	MODERATE [2]
☐	☐	HEAVY / SEVERE [1]

L	R	RIPARIAN WIDTH
☐	☐	WIDE > 50m [4]
☐	☐	MODERATE 10-50m [3]
☐	☐	NARROW 5-10m [2]
☑	☑	VERY NARROW < 5m [1]
☐	☐	NONE [0]

L	R	FLOOD PLAIN QUALITY
☐	☐	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

Riparian 4 *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 5 *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 3 *Maximum 8*

6] GRADIENT

(30 ft/mi)

DRAINAGE AREA

(1.19 mi²)

- ☐ VERY LOW - LOW [2-4]
- ☑ MODERATE [6-10]
- ☐ HIGH - VERY HIGH [10-6]

%POOL: 10 **%GLIDE:** 0 **%RUN:** 70 **%RIFFLE:** 20

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.

Stream is a part of a recreational area created for the area surrounding the mitigation area.

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

900 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	22
$\bar{x}$ depth	2.5
max. depth	3
$\bar{x}$ bankfull width	22
bankfull $\bar{x}$ depth	5
W/D ratio	9%
bankfull max. depth	5.5
floodprone x^2 width	347
entrench. ratio	15.7

Le *Tree:*

Stream Drawing:

Primary Headwater Habitat Evaluation Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1, 2, 3) : **28**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: **Anguin 138kV Extension No 4/Anguin-Brie 138kV R0**

S-CMS-003 SITE NUMBER: **1** RIVER BASIN: **Scioto River Basin** DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): **0.00**

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): **235** LAT.: **40.06118** LONG.: **-82.75688** RIVER CODE: _____ RIVER MILE: _____

DATE: **05/10/22** SCORER: **C. Stallone** COMMENTS: **Intermittent**

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

drainage outlet from man made pond

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]	95%
☐☐	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]	0%
☐☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	0%	☐☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0%
☐☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0%	☐☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	5%

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: **0.00%** (A)

Substrate Percentage Check: 100% (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): **4**

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): **3.00**

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		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: **Blacklick Creek** Distance from Evaluated Stream **11,000.00**

☐ 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: **New Albany** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Licking** Township / City: **New ALbany**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **05/09/22** Quantity: **0.50**

Photograph Information: _____

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **100%**

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): **N** (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

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Stream Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

S-CMS-002 **Date:** March 10, 2022 **Description:** Perennial Facing Upstream	

S-CMS-002 **Date:** March 10, 2022 **Description:** Perennial Facing Downstream	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Stream Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

S-CMS-002

Date:

March 10, 2022

Description:

Perennial

Substrate

S-CMS-003

Date:

May 11, 2022

Description:

Perennial

UNT to Blacklick Creek

Modified Class 1 PHW

Facing Upstream

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Stream Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

S-CMS-003

Date:

May 11, 2022

Description:

Perennial

UNT to Blacklick Creek

Modified Class 1 PHW

Facing Downstream

S-CMS-003

Date:

May 11, 2022

Description:

Perennial

UNT to Blacklick Creek

Modified Class 1 PHW

Substrate

APPENDIX E

POND PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Pond Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

P-CMS-001

Date:

March 10, 2022

Description:

Stormwater Retention Pond

Facing South

P-CMS-002

Date:

May 10, 2022

Description:

Manmade Pond

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Pond Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

P-MRK-001

Date:

October 13, 2022

Description:

Stormwater Retention Pond

Facing North

P-MRK-002

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Stormwater Retention Pond

Facing South

APPENDIX F

UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURE PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-CMS-001 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Upgradient	

UDF-CMS-001 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Downgradient	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-CMS-001 **Date:** May 10, 2022 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-001 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Upgradient	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-MRK-001

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing Downgradient

UDF-MRK-001

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing Substrate

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-MRK-002	
Date: August 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing Upgradient	

UDF-MRK-002	
Date: August 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing Downgradient	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-MRK-002 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-003 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Upgradient	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-MRK-003 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Downgradient	

UDF-MRK-003 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-MRK-004	
Date: August 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing Upgradient	

UDF-MRK-004	
Date: August 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing Downgradient	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-MRK-004

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing Substrate

UDF-MRK-005

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing Upgradient

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainag Feature Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

UDF-MRK-005 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Downgradient	

UDF-MRK-005 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

APPENDIX G

HABITAT PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Habitat Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

PH-01 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Old Field Facing North	

PH-02 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Landscaped Area Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Habitat Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

PH-03

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Stream/Wetland (Stormwater Retention Pond)

Facing West

PH-044

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Urban Area

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Habitat Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

PH-05 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Urban Area Facing South	

PH-06 **Date:** August 15, 2023 **Description:** Urban Area Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Habitat Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Anguin 138 kV Extension No. 5 Transmission Line Project	60714942

PH-07

Date:

August 15, 2023

Description:

Stream/Wetland

Facing South

Appendix E FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps

National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette

FEMA

82°46'19"W 40°3'49"N

82°45'41"W 40°3'21"N

0 250 500 1,000 1,500 2,000 Feet

1:6,000

Basemap Imagery Source: USGS National Map 2023

Legend

SEE FIS REPORT FOR DETAILED LEGEND AND INDEX MAP FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT

SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS
- Without Base Flood Elevation (BFE) *Zone A, V, A99*
- With BFE or Depth *Zone AE, AO, AH, VE, AR*
- Regulatory Floodway

OTHER AREAS OF FLOOD HAZARD
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard, Areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depth less than one foot or with drainage areas of less than one square mile *Zone X*
- Future Conditions 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard *Zone X*
- Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee. See Notes. *Zone X*
- Area with Flood Risk due to Levee *Zone D*

OTHER AREAS
- NO SCREEN Area of Minimal Flood Hazard *Zone X*
- Effective LOMRs
- Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard *Zone D*

GENERAL STRUCTURES
- Channel, Culvert, or Storm Sewer
- Levee, Dike, or Floodwall

OTHER FEATURES
- 20.2 Cross Sections with 1% Annual Chance
- 17.5 Water Surface Elevation
- Coastal Transect
- 513 Base Flood Elevation Line (BFE)
- Limit of Study
- Jurisdiction Boundary
- Coastal Transect Baseline
- Profile Baseline
- Hydrographic Feature

MAP PANELS
- Digital Data Available
- No Digital Data Available
- Unmapped

N

The pin displayed on the map is an approximate point selected by the user and does not represent an authoritative property location.

This map complies with FEMA's standards for the use of digital flood maps if it is not void as described below. The basemap shown complies with FEMA's basemap accuracy standards

The flood hazard information is derived directly from the authoritative NFHL web services provided by FEMA. This map was exported on 10/25/2023 at 3:19 PM and does not reflect changes or amendments subsequent to this date and time. The NFHL and effective information may change or become superseded by new data over time.

This map image is void if the one or more of the following map elements do not appear: basemap imagery, flood zone labels, legend, scale bar, map creation date, community identifiers, FIRM panel number, and FIRM effective date. Map images for unmapped and unmodernized areas cannot be used for regulatory purposes.

Summary: Notice Construction Notice electronically filed by Hector Garcia-Santana on behalf of Ohio Power Company.