

## **APPENDIX B**

### **ORAM Forms**



## Background Information

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C27, W-C28, W-C29	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PEM	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Depressional      Slope	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.938466 -81.533776
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C27, W-C28, W-C29	
<b>Wetland Size (acres, hectares):</b> 9.6 acres (W-C28 extends outside study area)	
<b>Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.</b> See Attached.	
<b>Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:</b>	
<b>Final score :</b> 37	<b>Category:</b> Modified 2

## 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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinatum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**



Site: W-C27, W-C28, W-C29

Rater(s): Codie Vilen

Date: 07/22/2016

3

3

## Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

max 6 pts.

subtotal

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☐ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☒ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☐ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☐ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

2

5

## Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

max 14 pts.

subtotal

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- ☐ WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- ☐ MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- ☐ NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- ☒ VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- ☐ VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- ☐ LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

19

24

## Metric 3. Hydrology.

max 30 pts.

subtotal

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☒ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☒ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☐ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☒ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (12)
- ☐ Recovered (7)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☒ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☒ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☐ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☐ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☐ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- ☒ ditch
- ☐ tile
- ☐ dike
- ☐ weir
- ☐ stormwater input

- ☐ point source (nonstormwater)
- ☐ filling/grading
- ☐ road bed/RR track
- ☐ dredging
- ☐ other

8

32

## Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

max 20 pts.

subtotal

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☐ Recovered (3)
- ☒ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☐ Recovered (6)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- ☒ mowing
- ☒ grazing
- ☐ clearcutting
- ☐ selective cutting
- ☐ woody debris removal
- ☐ toxic pollutants

- ☐ shrub/sapling removal
- ☐ herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- ☐ sedimentation
- ☐ dredging
- ☒ farming
- ☐ nutrient enrichment

32

subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C27, W-C28, W-C29	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vleno	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
----------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

32

subtotal first page

0	32
---	----

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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

5	37
---	----

max 20 pts.

subtotal

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ 0 Aquatic bed
- ☐ 1 Emergent
- ☐ 0 Shrub
- ☐ 0 Forest
- ☐ 0 Mudflats
- ☐ 1 Open water
- ☐ 0 Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersions.

Select only one.

- ☐ High (5)
- ☐ Moderately high(4)
- ☐ Moderate (3)
- ☐ Moderately low (2)
- ☒ Low (1)
- ☐ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☐ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☒ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☐ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ 1 Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- ☐ 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp 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

37
----

End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.



## 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 <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C30 PEM, W-C30 PFO, W-C31 PEM, W-C31 PFO, W-C32	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PEM PFO	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Riverine Depressional	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.933848 -81.535642
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C30 PEM, W-C30 PFO, W-C31 PEM, W-C31 PFO, W-C32	
<b>Wetland Size (acres, hectares):</b> 11.8 acres (W-C30 extends outside study area)	
<b>Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.</b> See Attached.	
<b>Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:</b>	
<b>Final score :</b> 37	<b>Category:</b> Modified 2

## 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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinatum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**

**Site:** W-C30 PEM, W-C30 PFO, W-C31 PEM **Rater(s):** Codie Vilen

**Date:** 07/22/2016

4	4
max 6 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☒ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☐ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☐ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☐ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

2	6
max 14 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

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)
- ☒ 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), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

19	25
max 30 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 3. Hydrology.

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☒ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☒ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☐ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☒ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (12)
- ☐ Recovered (7)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☒ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☒ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☐ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☐ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☐ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ditch	<input type="checkbox"/> point source (nonstormwater)
<input type="checkbox"/> tile	<input type="checkbox"/> filling/grading
<input type="checkbox"/> dike	<input type="checkbox"/> road bed/RR track
<input type="checkbox"/> weir	<input type="checkbox"/> dredging
<input type="checkbox"/> stormwater input	<input type="checkbox"/> other _____

8	33
max 20 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☐ Recovered (3)
- ☒ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☐ Recovered (6)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mowing	<input type="checkbox"/> shrub/sapling removal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> grazing	<input type="checkbox"/> herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
<input type="checkbox"/> clearcutting	<input type="checkbox"/> sedimentation
<input type="checkbox"/> selective cutting	<input type="checkbox"/> dredging
<input type="checkbox"/> woody debris removal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> farming
<input type="checkbox"/> toxic pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/> nutrient enrichment

33
subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C30 PEM, W-C30 PFO, W-C31 PEN	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
--	------------------------------	-------------------------

33

subtotal first page

0	33
---	----

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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

4	37
---	----

max 20 pts.

subtotal

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- 0

 Aquatic bed
- 1

 Emergent
- 0

 Shrub
- 1

 Forest
- 0

 Mudflats
- 0

 Open water
- 0

 Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersions.

Select only one.

- ☐ High (5)
- ☐ Moderately high(4)
- ☐ Moderate (3)
- ☐ Moderately low (2)
- ☐ Low (1)
- ☒ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☐ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☒ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☐ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- 1

 Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp 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

37

**End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.**

# 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	4	
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	2	
	Metric 3. Hydrology	19	
	Metric 4. Habitat	8	
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0	
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography	4	
	TOTAL SCORE	37	Category based on score breakpoints Modified 2

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 <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C33. W-C34	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PEM	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Depressional	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.934263 -81.534301
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

Name of Wetland: W-C33. W-C34	
Wetland Size (acres, hectares): 0.35 acres	
Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc. See Attached.	
Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:	
Final score : 27	Category: 2



## 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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinatum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**

<b>Site:</b> W-C33. W-C34	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

0	0
max 6 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☐ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☐ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☐ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☒ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

3	3
max 14 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

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)
- ☒ 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), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

13	16
max 30 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 3. Hydrology.

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☒ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☐ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☐ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☒ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (12)
- ☐ Recovered (7)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☒ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☐ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☒ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☐ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☐ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ditch <input type="checkbox"/> tile <input type="checkbox"/> dike <input type="checkbox"/> weir <input type="checkbox"/> stormwater input	<input type="checkbox"/> point source (nonstormwater) <input type="checkbox"/> filling/grading <input type="checkbox"/> road bed/RR track <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input type="checkbox"/> other _____

8	24
max 20 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☐ Recovered (3)
- ☒ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☐ Recovered (6)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mowing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> grazing <input type="checkbox"/> clearcutting <input type="checkbox"/> selective cutting <input type="checkbox"/> woody debris removal <input type="checkbox"/> toxic pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/> shrub/sapling removal <input type="checkbox"/> herbaceous/aquatic bed removal <input type="checkbox"/> sedimentation <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> farming <input type="checkbox"/> nutrient enrichment

24
subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C33. W-C34	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

24

subtotal first page

0	24
---	----

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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

3	27
---	----

max 20 pts.

subtotal

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 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) Interspersions.

Select only one.

- ☐ High (5)
- ☐ Moderately high (4)
- ☐ Moderate (3)
- ☐ Moderately low (2)
- ☐ Low (1)
- ☒ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☐ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☒ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☐ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ 1 Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- ☐ 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp 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

27
----

End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.

# ORAM Summary Worksheet

		circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	0		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	3		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	13		
	Metric 4. Habitat	8		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	3		
	TOTAL SCORE	27		Category based on score breakpoints 1 or 2 Gray Zone

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 <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C35, W-C38, W-C39, W-C40, W-C41	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PEM	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Depressional      Slope	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.934263 -81.534301
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C35, W-C38, W-C39, W-C40, W-C41	
<b>Wetland Size (acres, hectares):</b> 2.8 acres	
<b>Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.</b> See Attached.	
<b>Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:</b>	
<b>Final score :</b> 23	<b>Category:</b> 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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinatum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**

**Site:** W-C35, W-C38, W-C39, W-C40, W-C41 **Rater(s):** Codie Vilen

**Date:** 07/22/2016

2	2
max 6 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☐ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☐ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☒ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☐ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

3	5
max 14 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

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)
- ☒ 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), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

12	17
max 30 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 3. Hydrology.

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☒ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☐ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☐ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☒ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (12)
- ☐ Recovered (7)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☒ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☐ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☐ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☒ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☐ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ditch	<input type="checkbox"/> point source (nonstormwater)
<input type="checkbox"/> tile	<input type="checkbox"/> filling/grading
<input type="checkbox"/> dike	<input type="checkbox"/> road bed/RR track
<input type="checkbox"/> weir	<input type="checkbox"/> dredging
<input type="checkbox"/> stormwater input	<input type="checkbox"/> other _____

8	25
max 20 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☐ Recovered (3)
- ☒ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☐ Recovered (6)
- ☒ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mowing	<input type="checkbox"/> shrub/sapling removal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> grazing	<input type="checkbox"/> herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
<input type="checkbox"/> clearcutting	<input type="checkbox"/> sedimentation
<input type="checkbox"/> selective cutting	<input type="checkbox"/> dredging
<input type="checkbox"/> woody debris removal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> farming
<input type="checkbox"/> toxic pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/> nutrient enrichment

25
subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C35, W-C38, W-C39, W-C40, W-C4	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vleno	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---	------------------------------	-------------------------

25

subtotal first page

0	25
---	----

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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

-2	23
----	----

max 20 pts.

subtotal

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 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)
- ☐ Low (1)
- ☒ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☒ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☐ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☐ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ 0 Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- ☐ 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

### Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

### Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

23

**End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.**



## ORAM Summary Worksheet

		circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1. Critical Habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	3		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	12		
	Metric 4. Habitat	8		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	-2		
	TOTAL SCORE	23		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 <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C36, W-C37	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PUB	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Depressional	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.934692 -81.538323
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

Name of Wetland: W-C36, W-C37	
Wetland Size (acres, hectares): 2 acres	
Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc. See Attached.	
Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:	
Final score : 42	Category: Modified 2

## 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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinatum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**



<b>Site:</b> W-C36, W-C37	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
max 6 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☐ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☐ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☒ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☐ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
max 14 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

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)
- ☒ 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), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
max 30 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 3. Hydrology.

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☒ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☒ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☒ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☐ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (12)
- ☒ Recovered (7)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☒ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☒ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☐ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☐ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☐ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input type="checkbox"/> ditch <input type="checkbox"/> tile <input type="checkbox"/> dike <input type="checkbox"/> weir <input type="checkbox"/> stormwater input	<input type="checkbox"/> point source (nonstormwater) <input type="checkbox"/> filling/grading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> road bed/RR track <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input type="checkbox"/> other _____

<b>11</b>	<b>39</b>
max 20 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☐ Recovered (3)
- ☒ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☒ Recovered (6)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input type="checkbox"/> mowing <input type="checkbox"/> grazing <input type="checkbox"/> clearcutting <input type="checkbox"/> selective cutting <input type="checkbox"/> woody debris removal <input type="checkbox"/> toxic pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/> shrub/sapling removal <input type="checkbox"/> herbaceous/aquatic bed removal <input type="checkbox"/> sedimentation <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> farming <input type="checkbox"/> nutrient enrichment

<b>39</b>
subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C36, W-C37	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

39

subtotal first page

0	39
---	----

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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

3	42
---	----

max 20 pts.

subtotal

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- 1

 Aquatic bed
- 0

 Emergent
- 0

 Shrub
- 0

 Forest
- 0

 Mudflats
- 0

 Open water
- 0

 Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersions.

Select only one.

- ☐ High (5)
- ☐ Moderately high(4)
- ☐ Moderate (3)
- ☐ Moderately low (2)
- ☐ Low (1)
- ☒ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☐ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☐ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☒ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- 0

 Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp 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

42

**End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.**

# ORAM Summary Worksheet

		circle answer or insert score	Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2	
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	2	
	Metric 3. Hydrology	24	
	Metric 4. Habitat	11	
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0	
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography	3	
	TOTAL SCORE	42	Category based on score breakpoints Modified 2

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 <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C42, W-C43	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PEM	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Depressional	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.942314 -81.535733
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C42, W-C43	
<b>Wetland Size (acres, hectares):</b> 0.91 acres (Both wetlands continue outside study area)	
<b>Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.</b> See Attached.	
<b>Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:</b>	
<b>Final score :</b> 37	<b>Category:</b> Modified 2

## 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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinatum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**

<b>Site:</b> W-C42, W-C43	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
max 6 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☐ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☐ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☒ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☐ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
max 14 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

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)
- ☒ 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), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

<b>22</b>	<b>27</b>
max 30 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 3. Hydrology.

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☒ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☐ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☐ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☒ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☒ None or none apparent (12)
- ☐ Recovered (7)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☒ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☐ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☒ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☐ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☐ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input type="checkbox"/> ditch <input type="checkbox"/> tile <input type="checkbox"/> dike <input type="checkbox"/> weir <input type="checkbox"/> stormwater input	<input type="checkbox"/> point source (nonstormwater) <input type="checkbox"/> filling/grading <input type="checkbox"/> road bed/RR track <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input type="checkbox"/> other _____

<b>12</b>	<b>39</b>
max 20 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☒ Recovered (3)
- ☐ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☒ Recovered (6)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mowing <input type="checkbox"/> grazing <input type="checkbox"/> clearcutting <input type="checkbox"/> selective cutting <input type="checkbox"/> woody debris removal <input type="checkbox"/> toxic pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/> shrub/sapling removal <input type="checkbox"/> herbaceous/aquatic bed removal <input type="checkbox"/> sedimentation <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> farming <input type="checkbox"/> nutrient enrichment

<b>39</b>
subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C42, W-C43	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vleno	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

39

subtotal first page

0	39
---	----

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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

-2	37
----	----

max 20 pts.

subtotal

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 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) Interspersions.

Select only one.

- ☐ High (5)
- ☐ Moderately high(4)
- ☐ Moderate (3)
- ☐ Moderately low (2)
- ☐ Low (1)
- ☒ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☒ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☐ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☐ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ 0 Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- ☐ 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp 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

37
----

End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.

# ORAM Summary Worksheet

		circle answer or insert score	Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2	
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	3	
	Metric 3. Hydrology	22	
	Metric 4. Habitat	12	
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0	
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography	-2	
	TOTAL SCORE	37	Category based on score breakpoints Modified 2

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is quantitative rating score <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is quantitative rating score <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  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
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.**

## Background Information

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C44	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PEM	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Depressional	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.942778 -81.538282
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

Name of Wetland: W-C44	
Wetland Size (acres, hectares): 0.17acres (Continues outside study area)	
Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc. See Attached.	
Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:	
Final score : 22	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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinatum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**

<b>Site:</b> W-C44	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
--------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

0	0
max 6 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☐ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☐ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☐ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☒ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

2	2
max 14 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

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)
- ☒ 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), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

11	13
max 30 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 3. Hydrology.

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☐ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☐ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☐ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☒ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (12)
- ☒ Recovered (7)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☐ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☐ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☐ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☐ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☒ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ditch <input type="checkbox"/> tile <input type="checkbox"/> dike <input type="checkbox"/> weir <input type="checkbox"/> stormwater input	<input type="checkbox"/> point source (nonstormwater) <input type="checkbox"/> filling/grading <input type="checkbox"/> road bed/RR track <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input type="checkbox"/> other _____

12	25
max 20 pts.	subtotal

### Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☒ Recovered (3)
- ☐ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☒ Recovered (6)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mowing <input type="checkbox"/> grazing <input type="checkbox"/> clearcutting <input type="checkbox"/> selective cutting <input type="checkbox"/> woody debris removal <input type="checkbox"/> toxic pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/> shrub/sapling removal <input type="checkbox"/> herbaceous/aquatic bed removal <input type="checkbox"/> sedimentation <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input type="checkbox"/> farming <input type="checkbox"/> nutrient enrichment

25
subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C44	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vleno	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
--------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

25

subtotal first page

0	25	
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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

-3	22	
max 20 pts.	subtotal	

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ Aquatic bed
- ☐ Emergent
- ☐ Shrub
- ☐ Forest
- ☐ Mudflats
- ☐ Open water
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersions.

Select only one.

- ☐ High (5)
- ☐ Moderately high(4)
- ☐ Moderate (3)
- ☐ Moderately low (2)
- ☐ Low (1)
- ☒ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☒ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☐ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☐ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- ☐ 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp 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

22

**End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.**

## ORAM Summary Worksheet

		circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1. Critical Habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	0		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	2		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	11		
	Metric 4. Habitat	12		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography	-3		
	TOTAL SCORE	22		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 <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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

<b>Name:</b> Codie Vilen	
<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016	
<b>Affiliation:</b> Tetra Tech	
<b>Address:</b> 661 Andersen Drive, Foster Plaza 7, Pittsburgh, PA 15220	
<b>Phone Number:</b> (412) 921-7090	
<b>e-mail address:</b>	
<b>Name of Wetland:</b> W-C45, W-C46	
<b>Vegetation Communit(ies):</b> PEM PFO	
<b>HGM Class(es):</b> Depressional	
<b>Location of Wetland:</b> include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc. Attached.	
Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate	39.940156 -81.537479
USGS Quad Name	Byesville
County	Guernsey
Township	Byesville
Section and Subsection	
Hydrologic Unit Code	050400050207
Site Visit	07/22/2016
National Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3a
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map	Fig. 3b
Soil Survey	Fig. 2
Delineation report/map	Attached

Name of Wetland: W-C45, W-C46	
Wetland Size (acres, hectares): 0.66 acres	
Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc. See Attached.	
Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:	
Final score : 26	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
<b>Step 1</b>	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	✓	
<b>Step 2</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 3</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 4</b>	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.	✓	
<b>Step 5</b>	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	✓	
<b>Step 6</b>	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.	✓	

**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	<b>Critical Habitat.</b> 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	<b>Threatened or Endangered Species.</b> 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	<b>Documented High Quality Wetland.</b> 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	<b>Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.</b> 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	<b>Category 1 Wetlands.</b> Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and <b>hydrologically isolated</b> and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> , <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> , or <i>Phragmites australis</i> , 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	<b>Bogs.</b> Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly <i>Sphagnum</i> 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	<b>Fens.</b> 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	<b>"Old Growth Forest."</b> 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	<b>Mature forested wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands.</b> 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	<b>Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)</b> 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	<b>Relict Wet Prairies.</b> 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.**

<b>invasive/exotic spp</b>	<b>fen species</b>	<b>bog species</b>	<b>Oak Opening species</b>	<b>wet prairie species</b>
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	<i>Zygadenus elegans</i> var. <i>glaucus</i>	<i>Calla palustris</i>	<i>Carex cryptolepis</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	<i>Cacalia plantaginea</i>	<i>Carex atlantica</i> var. <i>capillacea</i>	<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>
<i>Najas minor</i>	<i>Carex flava</i>	<i>Carex echinata</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex atherodes</i>
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	<i>Carex sterilis</i>	<i>Carex oligosperma</i>	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>	<i>Carex buxbaumii</i>
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	<i>Carex stricta</i>	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	<i>Calamagrostis stricta</i>	<i>Carex pellita</i>
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>	<i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i>	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	<i>Carex sartwellii</i>
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	<i>Eleocharis rostellata</i>	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	<i>Gentiana andrewsii</i>
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	<i>Eriophorum viridicarinarum</i>	<i>Eriophorum virginicum</i>		<i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	<i>Gentianopsis</i> spp.	<i>Larix laricina</i>		<i>Liatris spicata</i>
<i>Typha xglauca</i>	<i>Lobelia kalmii</i>	<i>Nemopanthus mucronatus</i>		<i>Lysimachia quadriflora</i>
	<i>Parnassia glauca</i>	<i>Scheuchzeria palustris</i>		<i>Lythrum alatum</i>
	<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	<i>Sphagnum</i> spp.		<i>Pycnanthemum virginianum</i>
	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	<i>Vaccinium macrocarpon</i>		<i>Silphium terebinthinaceum</i>
	<i>Rhynchospora capillacea</i>	<i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>		<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
	<i>Salix candida</i>	<i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i>		<i>Spartina pectinata</i>
	<i>Salix myricoides</i>	<i>Woodwardia virginica</i>		<i>Solidago riddellii</i>
	<i>Salix serissima</i>	<i>Xyris difformis</i>		
	<i>Solidago ohioensis</i>			
	<i>Tofieldia glutinosa</i>			
	<i>Triglochin maritimum</i>			
	<i>Triglochin palustre</i>			

**End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.**

<b>Site:</b> W-C45, W-C46	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

0	0
max 6 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

Select one size class and assign score.

- ☐ >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- ☐ 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- ☐ 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- ☐ 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- ☐ 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- ☐ 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- ☒ <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

2	2
max 14 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

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)
- ☒ 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), shrub land, young second growth forest. (5)
- ☒ MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- ☐ HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

11	13
max 30 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 3. Hydrology.

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- ☐ High pH groundwater (5)
- ☐ Other groundwater (3)
- ☒ Precipitation (1)
- ☐ Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- ☐ Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- ☐ 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- ☒ <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (12)
- ☒ Recovered (7)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- ☐ 100 year floodplain (1)
- ☐ Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- ☒ Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- ☐ Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- ☐ Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- ☐ Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- ☐ Seasonally inundated (2)
- ☒ Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ditch <input type="checkbox"/> tile <input type="checkbox"/> dike <input type="checkbox"/> weir <input type="checkbox"/> stormwater input	<input type="checkbox"/> point source (nonstormwater) <input type="checkbox"/> filling/grading <input type="checkbox"/> road bed/RR track <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input type="checkbox"/> other _____

12	25
max 20 pts.	subtotal

## Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

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

- ☐ None or none apparent (4)
- ☒ Recovered (3)
- ☐ Recovering (2)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- ☐ Excellent (7)
- ☐ Very good (6)
- ☐ Good (5)
- ☐ Moderately good (4)
- ☒ Fair (3)
- ☐ Poor to fair (2)
- ☐ Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- ☐ None or none apparent (9)
- ☒ Recovered (6)
- ☐ Recovering (3)
- ☐ Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mowing <input type="checkbox"/> grazing <input type="checkbox"/> clearcutting <input type="checkbox"/> selective cutting <input type="checkbox"/> woody debris removal <input type="checkbox"/> toxic pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/> shrub/sapling removal <input type="checkbox"/> herbaceous/aquatic bed removal <input type="checkbox"/> sedimentation <input type="checkbox"/> dredging <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> farming <input type="checkbox"/> nutrient enrichment

25
subtotal this page

<b>Site:</b> W-C45, W-C46	<b>Rater(s):</b> Codie Vilen	<b>Date:</b> 07/22/2016
---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

25

subtotal first page

0	25
---	----

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 Prairies (10)
- ☐ Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- ☐ Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- ☐ Category 1 Wetland. See Question 1 Qualitative Rating (-10)

1	26
---	----

max 20 pts.

subtotal

## Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography.

### 6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ Aquatic bed
- ☐ Emergent
- ☐ Shrub
- ☐ Forest
- ☐ Mudflats
- ☐ Open water
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersions.

Select only one.

- ☐ High (5)
- ☐ Moderately high(4)
- ☒ Moderate (3)
- ☐ Moderately low (2)
- ☐ Low (1)
- ☐ None (0)

### 6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer to Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- ☐ Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- ☒ Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- ☐ Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- ☐ Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- ☐ Absent (1)

### 6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- ☐ Vegetated hummocks/tussocks
- ☐ 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 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 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 vegetation and is of high quality

### Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

low	Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or disturbance tolerant native species
mod	Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generally w/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp
high	A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

### Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

### Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

26

**End of Quantitative Rating. Complete Categorization Worksheets.**



## ORAM Summary Worksheet

		circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1. Critical Habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	NO ✓	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	NO ✓	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	0		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	2		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	11		
	Metric 4. Habitat	12		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersions, microtopography	1		
	TOTAL SCORE	26		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 <i>less</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>excluding</i> 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 <i>greater</i> than the Category 2 scoring threshold ( <i>including</i> 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 <i>moderate OR superior</i> hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was <i>not</i> 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.**

## **APPENDIX C**

# **Wetland Photographs**





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	1	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C27	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	W	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	2	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C28	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	W	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	3	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C29	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	W	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	4	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C30	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	SE	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	5	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C30	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PFO
<b>Direction:</b>	SW	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	6	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C31	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	7	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C31	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PFO
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	8	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C32	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	E	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	9	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C33	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PFO3
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	10	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C34	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	E	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	11	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C35	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	12	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C36	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	13	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C37	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	14	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C38	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	15	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C39	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	S	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	16	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C40	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	N	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	17	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C41	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	NW	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	18	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C42	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	E	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	19	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C43	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	SE	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	20	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C44	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	NW	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	21	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C45	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	NE	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	22	<b>Feature Name:</b>	W-C46	<b>Cowardin Class:</b>	PEM
<b>Direction:</b>	W	<b>Date:</b>	07/21/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



Photograph Number:	23	Feature Name:	W-C46	Cowardin Class:	PFO
Direction:	S	Date:	07/21/2016	Remarks:	



## **APPENDIX D**

### **QHEI Form**





# Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index and Use Assessment Field Sheet

QHEI Score:

42

Poor

Stream &amp; Location: S-C38 (Wills Creek)

RM: Date: 07/20/16

Scorers Full Name &amp; Affiliation:

River Code:

STORET #:

Lat./Long.: 39.9307 181.5371

Office verified location ☐

1] SUBSTRATE Check ONLY Two substrate TYPE BOXES; estimate % or note every type present

Check ONE (Or 2 &amp; average)

BEST TYPES	POOL RIFFLE	OTHER TYPES	POOL RIFFLE
<input type="checkbox"/> BLDR / SLABS [10]		<input type="checkbox"/> HARDPAN [4]	
<input type="checkbox"/> BOULDER [9]		<input type="checkbox"/> DETRITUS [3]	
<input type="checkbox"/> COBBLE [8]		<input type="checkbox"/> MUCK [2]	
<input type="checkbox"/> GRAVEL [7]	X	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SILT [2]	X
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAND [6]	X	<input type="checkbox"/> ARTIFICIAL [0]	
<input type="checkbox"/> BEDROCK [5]			

ORIGIN
<input type="checkbox"/> LIMESTONE [1]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TILLS [1]
<input type="checkbox"/> WETLANDS [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> HARDPAN [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> SANDSTONE [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> RIP/RAP [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> LACUSTURINE [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> SHALE [-1]
<input type="checkbox"/> COAL FINES [-2]

QUALITY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HEAVY [-2]
<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [-1]
<input type="checkbox"/> NORMAL [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> FREE [1]
<input type="checkbox"/> EXTENSIVE [-2]
<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [-1]
<input type="checkbox"/> NORMAL [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> NONE [1]

Substrate  
8  
Maximum  
20NUMBER OF BEST TYPES: ☐ 4 or more [2] ☒ 3 or less [0]

Comments

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.

AMOUNT

Check ONE (Or 2 &amp; average)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNDERCUT BANKS [1]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> POOLS > 70cm [2]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OXBOWS, BACKWATERS [1]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OVERHANGING VEGETATION [1]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ROOTWADS [1]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AQUATIC MACROPHYTES [1]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHALLOWS (IN SLOW WATER) [1]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BOULDERS [1]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LOGS OR WOODY DEBRIS [1]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ROOTMATS [1]		

<input type="checkbox"/> EXTENSIVE >75% [11]
<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE 25-75% [7]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPARSE 5-<25% [3]
<input type="checkbox"/> NEARLY ABSENT <5% [1]

Cover  
Maximum  
20  
8

Comments

3] CHANNEL MORPHOLOGY Check ONE in each category (Or 2 &amp; average)

SINUOSITY	DEVELOPMENT	CHANNELIZATION	STABILITY
<input type="checkbox"/> HIGH [4]	<input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT [7]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE [6]	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGH [3]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [3]	<input type="checkbox"/> GOOD [5]	<input type="checkbox"/> RECOVERED [4]	<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [2]
<input type="checkbox"/> LOW [2]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAIR [3]	<input type="checkbox"/> RECOVERING [3]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LOW [1]
<input type="checkbox"/> NONE [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> POOR [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> RECENT OR NO RECOVERY [1]	

Channel  
Maximum  
20  
13

Comments

4] BANK EROSION AND RIPARIAN ZONE Check ONE in each category for EACH BANK (Or 2 per bank &amp; average)

EROSION	RIPARIAN WIDTH	FLOOD PLAIN QUALITY	CONSERVATION TILLAGE
<input type="checkbox"/> NONE / LITTLE [3]	<input type="checkbox"/> WIDE > 50m [4]	<input type="checkbox"/> FOREST, SWAMP [3]	<input type="checkbox"/> URBAN OR INDUSTRIAL [0]
<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [2]	<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE 10-50m [3]	<input type="checkbox"/> SHRUB OR OLD FIELD [2]	<input type="checkbox"/> MINING / CONSTRUCTION [0]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HEAVY / SEVERE [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> NARROW 5-10m [2]	<input type="checkbox"/> RESIDENTIAL, PARK, NEW FIELD [1]	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERY NARROW < 5m [1]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FENCED PASTURE [1]	
	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE [0]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OPEN PASTURE, ROWCROP [0]	

Indicate predominant land use(s)  
past 100m riparian.Riparian  
Maximum  
10  
2

Comments

5] POOL / GLIDE AND RIFFLE / RUN QUALITY

MAXIMUM DEPTH

Check ONE (ONLY!)

<input type="checkbox"/> > 1m [6]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0.7-1m [4]
<input type="checkbox"/> 0.4-0.7m [2]
<input type="checkbox"/> 0.2-0.4m [1]
<input type="checkbox"/> < 0.2m [0]

CHANNEL WIDTH

Check ONE (Or 2 &amp; average)

<input type="checkbox"/> POOL WIDTH > RIFFLE WIDTH [2]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> POOL WIDTH = RIFFLE WIDTH [1]
<input type="checkbox"/> POOL WIDTH < RIFFLE WIDTH [0]

CURRENT VELOCITY

Check ALL that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> TORRENTIAL [-1]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SLOW [1]
<input type="checkbox"/> VERY FAST [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> INTERSTITIAL [-1]
<input type="checkbox"/> FAST [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> INTERMITTENT [-2]
<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> EDDIES [1]

Indicate for reach - pools and riffles.

Recreation Potential  
Primary Contact  
Secondary Contact  
(circle one and comment on back)Pool /  
Current  
Maximum  
12  
6

Comments

Indicate for functional riffles; Best areas must be large enough to support a population of riffle-obligate species:

Check ONE (Or 2 &amp; average).

☐ NO RIFFLE [metric=0]

RIFFLE DEPTH	RUN DEPTH	RIFFLE / RUN SUBSTRATE	RIFFLE / RUN EMBEDDEDNESS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEST AREAS > 10cm [2]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MAXIMUM > 50cm [2]	<input type="checkbox"/> STABLE (e.g., Cobble, Boulder) [2]	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE [2]
<input type="checkbox"/> BEST AREAS 5-10cm [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> MAXIMUM < 50cm [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> MOD. STABLE (e.g., Large Gravel) [1]	<input type="checkbox"/> LOW [1]
<input type="checkbox"/> BEST AREAS < 5cm [metric=0]		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNSTABLE (e.g., Fine Gravel, Sand) [0]	<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [0]
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EXTENSIVE [-1]

Riffle /  
Run  
Maximum  
8  
3

Comments

6] GRADIENT (30' / 1 mi ft/mi)

DRAINAGE AREA

(412 mi<sup>2</sup>)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERY LOW - LOW [2-4]
<input type="checkbox"/> MODERATE [6-10]
<input type="checkbox"/> HIGH - VERY HIGH [10-6]

%POOL: 10

%GLIDE: 30

%RUN: 30

%RIFFLE: 10

Gradient

Maximum

10

2

# A) SAMPLED REACH

Check ALL that apply

Comment RE: Reach consistency/ is reach typical of stream?, Recreation/ Observed - Inferred, Other/ Sampling observations, Concerns, Access directions, etc.

## METHOD

- ☐ BOAT  
☐ WADE  
☐ L. LINE  
☒ OTHER

## DISTANCE

- 1st - sample pass - 2nd  
☐ HIGH  
☐ UP  
☐ NORMAL  
☒ LOW  
☐ DRY

## CLARITY

- 1st - sample pass - 2nd  
☐ < 20 cm  
☐ 20-40 cm  
☐ 40-70 cm  
☐ > 70 cm/CTB  
☐ SECCHI DEPTH

## CANOPY

- 1st - sample pass - 2nd  
☐ > 85% - OPEN  
☒ 55% - < 85%  
☐ 30% - < 55%  
☐ 10% - < 30%  
☐ < 10% - CLOSED

## B) AESTHETICS

- ☐ NUISANCE ALGAE  
☐ INVASIVE MACROPHYTES  
☒ EXCESS TURBIDITY  
☐ DISCOLORATION  
☐ FOAM / SCUM  
☐ OIL SHEEN  
☐ TRASH / LITTER  
☐ NUISANCE ODOR  
☐ SLUDGE DEPOSITS  
☐ CSOs/ISSOs/OUTFALLS

## D) MAINTENANCE

- ☐ 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<sub>2</sub>O / TILE / H<sub>2</sub>O TABLE  
☐ ACID / MINE / QUARRY / FLOW  
☐ NATURAL / WETLAND / STAGNANT  
☐ PARK / GOLF / LAWN / HOME  
☐ ATMOSPHERE / DATA PAUCITY

## F) MEASUREMENTS

- ☐  $\bar{x}$  width 60'  
☐  $\bar{x}$  depth > 3'  
☐ max. depth  
☐  $\bar{x}$  bankfull width 115'  
☐ bankfull  $\bar{x}$  depth 15'  
☐ W/D ratio  
☐ bankfull max. depth  
☐ floodprone  $\bar{x}^2$  width  
☐ entrench. ratio

Legacy Tree:

## Stream Drawing:

C) RECREATION AREA DEPTH  
POOL: ☐ > 100ft<sup>2</sup> ☐ > 3ft

## **APPENDIX E**

### **Stream Photographs**





<b>Photograph Number:</b>	1	<b>Feature Name:</b>	S-C38	<b>Flow Regime:</b>	Perennial
<b>Direction:</b>	NW, Upstream	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	



<b>Photograph Number:</b>	2	<b>Feature Name:</b>	S-C38	<b>Flow Regime:</b>	Perennial
<b>Direction:</b>	E, Across	<b>Date:</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Remarks:</b>	





## **APPENDIX E**

### **Resumes**



## EXPERIENCE SUMMARY

Mr. Vleno has worked in the environmental field for over seven years. His experience includes conducting wetland delineations, habitat assessments, and endangered species surveys. He has additional experience performing and supervising Phase 1 archaeological surveys. Mr. Vleno's educational background includes graduate level studies in wetland ecology, stream ecology, hydrology, wetland/stream restoration methods, geology, and environmental impact assessments.

## RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

**Environmental Scientist III; Environmental and Restoration Services Contract for Site 73, Site 178, and Site 20. Army Corps of Engineers Louisville District. Savanna, Illinois; November 2014.** Conducted wetland delineation and threatened and endangered species review in support of remedial activities. Responsible for field effort and report deliverables.

**Environmental Scientist III; Sunoco Logistics; Wetland Delineation and Engendered Species Survey for Pennsylvania Pipeline Project; Pennsylvania, January 2014 to December 2014.** Conducted wetland delineations and endangered species survey along pipeline right-of-way. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Sunoco Logistics; Wetland Delineation and Engendered Species Survey for Ohio Pipeline Project; Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, January 2014 to December 2014.** Conducted wetland delineations and endangered species survey along pipeline right-of-way. Specific tasks included field survey, report preparation, and permitting activities.

**Environmental Scientist III; Rice Energy; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Pennsylvania and Ohio.** Conducts wetland delineations and permitting activities for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in eastern Ohio. Specific tasks include field survey, report preparation, completion of Ohio EPA specific wetland/stream assessments, agency consultation, and compiling of PCN.

**Environmental Scientist III; MarkWest Liberty Midstream & Resources, LLC; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Pennsylvania.** Conducts wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in southwestern Pennsylvania. Specific tasks included field survey, report preparation, and wetland functional assessments.

**Environmental Scientist III; MarkWest Ohio Gathering Company, LLC; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Ohio.** Conducts wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in eastern Ohio. Specific tasks included field survey, report preparation, and completion of Ohio EPA specific wetland and stream assessments.

**Environmental Scientist III; Gulfport Energy Corporation; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Well Pad Projects; Ohio.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations for various proposed natural well pads southeastern Ohio. Specific tasks included field survey, report preparation, PCN preparation, and completion of Ohio EPA specific wetland and stream assessments.

## EDUCATION

B.A., Anthropology, 2007, State University College at Buffalo

## AREA OF EXPERTISE

Wetland Science

## TRAINING/CERTIFICATIONS

38 Hour ACOE Wetland Delineation Training Program, November 2009

Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands Training Course, May 2013

Identifying Grasses, Sedges, and Rushes, June 2014

Winter Woody Plant Identification, April 2015

Running Buffalo Clover, Virginia Spirea, and Small Whorled Pogonia Federal RTE Identification Workshop, May 2015

Engineering for Ecosystem Restoration Workshop, June 2010

American Red Cross Adult First Aid/CPR/AED, March 2015

16 Hour Wilderness First Aid, November 2012

40 hours EPA 165.5 HAZWOPER Health and Safety Worker 2012

## OFFICE

Pittsburgh, PA

## YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

7+

## YEARS WITHIN FIRM

7+

## CONTACT

Codie.Vleno@TetraTech.com

**Environmental Scientist III; MarkWest Liberty Midstream & Resources, LLC; Wetland Delineation and Endangered Species Survey (Ranunculus flabellaris and Alopecurus aequalis) for Vanport to Butler Gas Pipeline; Butler County, Pennsylvania.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineation and endangered species survey along pipeline right-of-way. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Antero Resources Appalachian Corp.; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Ritchie and Doddridge Counties, West Virginia.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas well pads and access roads in northern West Virginia. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Stone Energy; Wetland Delineation for Mercer 1 Well Pad; Sisterville, Tyler County, West Virginia; September 2012.** Performed wetland delineation for proposed natural gas well pad and associated access road. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Laurel Mountain Midstream Operating, LLC; Endangered Species Survey (Yellow Passionflower) for Miller to Headlee Pipeline Project; Greene and Cumberland Townships, Greene County, Pennsylvania; September 2012.** Assisted with botanical survey for yellow passionflower along the proposed Miller to Headlee natural gas pipeline right-of-way and access roads. Tasks included pre-survey research, field survey, and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Laurel Mountain Midstream Operating, LLC; Endangered Species Survey (Drooping Bluegrass) for Nickelville Pipeline Project; Nickelville, Venango County, Pennsylvania; July 2012.** Assisted with botanical survey for drooping bluegrass along the proposed Nickelville natural gas pipeline right-of-way. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Laurel Mountain Midstream Operating, LLC; Endangered Species Survey (Tall Larkspur) for Dunlap Creek Pipeline Project; Luzerne and Redstone Townships, Fayette County, Pennsylvania; June 2012.** Assisted with botanical survey for tall larkspur along the proposed Dunlap Creek natural gas pipeline right-of-way and access roads. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Laurel Mountain Midstream Operating, LLC; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Pennsylvania.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in southwestern Pennsylvania. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Environmental Scientist III; Enervest Operating, LLC; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Ohio.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in southeastern Ohio. Specific tasks included field survey, report preparation, and completion of Ohio EPA specific wetland and stream assessments.

**Environmental Scientist III; NAVFAC Washington; Marine Corps Base Quantico Wetland Functional Analysis; Quantico, Virginia; April 2012.** Assisted with wetland functional assessments in support of remedial activities.

**Environmental Scientist III; NASA; Wallops Flight Facility Remedial Action Contract; Wallops Island, Virginia; March 2012.** Assisted with wetland delineation and wetland functional assessments in support of remedial activities.

**Environmental Scientist III; Burnett Oil Company, Inc.; New Salem, Pennsylvania; December 2011 to February 2012.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in southwestern Pennsylvania. Specific tasks included field survey and report preparation.

**Scientist I; Army Corps of Engineers; South Park Lake Dredge Project; Buffalo, New York; October 2011.** Supervised Phase 1 archaeological survey in preparation of dredging activities.

**Scientist I; Dominion East Ohio; Monroe County Gas Pipeline Project; Indiana Bat Habitat Assessment and Wetland Delineation; Woodsfield, Ohio; July 2011 to September 2011.** Assisted with Indiana Bat habitat assessment and wetland delineation along a proposed natural gas pipeline right-of-way. Specific tasks included field survey and completion of Ohio EPA specific wetland and stream assessments. Other responsibilities included Phase 1A archaeological assessment.

**Archaeological Technician; National Grid; Lockport to Mortimer; Rochester, New York; May 2011 to October 2011.** Performed Phase 1 archaeological survey in support of transmission line replacement. Assisted with report preparation.

**Scientist I; National Fuel Gas Company; Tioga Pipeline Expansion; Tioga County, Pennsylvania; June 2011 to September 2011.** Assisted with wetland delineation along proposed natural gas pipeline right-of-way. Other responsibilities included performing a Phase 1A archaeological assessment and supervising a Phase 1 archaeological survey.

**Archaeological Technician; National Fuel Gas Company; Allegheny National Forest Pipeline Project; Warren, Pennsylvania; September 2009 to October 2009.** Performed Phase 1 archaeological survey along proposed natural gas pipeline right-of-way.

**Archaeological Technician; Dominion East Ohio; Pipeline Replacement; Wooster, Ohio; June 2008 to July 2009.** Performed Phase 1 archaeological survey along proposed natural gas pipeline right-of-way.

**Archaeological Technician; Haley & Aldrich, Inc.; AES Sparrows Point LNG; Cecil County, Maryland; June 2008 to July 2008.** Performed Phase 1 archaeological survey along proposed natural gas pipeline right-of-way.

**Archaeological Technician; Horizon Wind Energy, LLC; Arkwright Wind Farm; Arkwright, New York; September 2008 to March 2009.** Performed Phase 1 archaeological survey on proposed turbine pads and transmission lines.

**Archaeological Technician; National Fuel Gas Supply Company.; Galbraith Storage Field Expansion Project; Allegheny National Forest, Marienville, Pennsylvania; August 2008 to October 2008.** Performed Phase 1 archaeological survey along proposed natural gas pipeline right-of-way.

## CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY

Environmental Scientist IV; Tetra Tech, Inc.; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; 2011 – Present

Scientist I; Tetra Tech, Inc.; Buffalo, New York; June 2008 – November 2011

Research Assistant; State University of New York Research Foundation; Buffalo, New York; October 2009 – January 2010

On-Call Research Assistant; State University of New York Research Foundation; Buffalo, New York; May 2009 – August 2009

Report Writer; Tetra Tech Laboratories; Amherst, New York; November 2007 – June 2008

## SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

N/A

## MEMBERSHIPS

- Society of Wetland Scientists





## Cody R. Stoliker

### ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST I

#### EXPERIENCE SUMMARY

Cody R. Stoliker has approximately 1 year of professional experience in wetland delineation, permitting, and stream assessments and classification in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia. With 4 years of fisheries and wildlife management experience, specializing in large game conservation, Mr. Stoliker has technician experience working with bear, elk, moose, deer, and wolves in Wyoming, as well as biologist work with whitetail deer, red stag, feral hogs, and the endangered American Burying Beetle in Oklahoma along pipeline routes where he produced habitat assessments, post monitoring impact statements and performed population control. Mr. Stoliker is assisting Tetra Tech field leads and other environmental scientists to assess and delineate streams and wetlands along natural gas pipeline routes, access roads, right-of-ways, and well pad sites. Cody R. Stoliker's educational background is in Wildlife Management with a minor focus in wetland assessment/delineation and fisheries.

#### RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

**Environmental Scientist I; Sunoco Logistics; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects Pennsylvania.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations and stream assessments for the proposed Pennsylvania Pipeline Project. Other responsibilities included report preparation and wetland functional assessments.

**Environmental Scientist I; MarkWest Liberty Midstream & Resources, LLC; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Pennsylvania.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in southwestern Pennsylvania. Specific tasks included field survey, report preparation, and wetland functional assessments.

**Environmental Scientist I; MarkWest Ohio Gathering Company, LLC; Wetland Delineations for Miscellaneous Natural Gas Pipeline Projects; Ohio.** Responsible for performing and assisting with wetland delineations for various proposed natural gas pipeline projects in eastern Ohio. Specific tasks included field survey, report preparation, and completion of Ohio EPA specific wetland and stream assessments.

#### EDUCATION

Bachelor of Technology, Wildlife Management, 2013, State University of New York at Cobleskill

#### AREA OF EXPERTISE

Large Game Wildlife Management & Conservation, Wetland Assessment

#### REGISTRATIONS/ AFFILIATIONS

Ducks Unlimited 2012- Present

Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation 2013 – Present

National Wild Turkey Federation 2013 - Present

#### TRAINING/CERTIFICATIONS

Certified Wetland Assessment Delineator, NY, 2010

NYS Certified Class A Interior Firefighter

#### OFFICE

Tetra Tech OGA  
Pittsburgh, PA

#### YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

1

#### YEARS WITH TETRA TECH

1

## SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

---

N/A

## CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY

---

Environmental Scientist I, Tetra Tech, 2014-2015, Pittsburgh, PA

Wildlife Biologist/Ranch Manager, Oklahoma Trophy Ranch, 2013-2014, Allen, OK

Wildlife Management Technician, Rolling Thunder & Rim Ranches, Spring-Fall 2013, Bondurant, WY

Assistant Herdsman, Bison Island, 2012-2013, Sharon Springs, NY

Avian Survey Technician, NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation, Winter 2011, Albany NY



## Appendix K: Species Correspondence

---

- USFWS Response – August 17, 2016
- ODNR Response – September 16, 2016



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Ecological Services Office  
4625 Morse Road, Suite 104  
Columbus, Ohio 43230  
(614) 416-8993 / Fax (614) 416-8994



TAILS# 03E15000-2016-TA-1509

Dear Ms. Gresock,

We have received your recent correspondence requesting information about the subject proposal. There are no federal wilderness areas, wildlife refuges or designated critical habitat within the vicinity of the project area. The following comments and recommendations will assist you in fulfilling the requirements for consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) recommends that proposed developments avoid and minimize water quality impacts and impacts to high quality fish and wildlife habitat (e.g., forests, streams, wetlands). Additionally, natural buffers around streams and wetlands should be preserved to enhance beneficial functions. If streams or wetlands will be impacted, the 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. All disturbed areas should be mulched and revegetated with native plant species. Prevention of non-native, invasive plant establishment is critical in maintaining high quality habitats.

**FEDERALLY LISTED SPECIES COMMENTS:** All projects in the State of Ohio lie within the range of the federally endangered **Indiana bat** (*Myotis sodalis*) and the federally threatened **northern long-eared bat** (*Myotis septentrionalis*). In Ohio, presence of the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat is assumed 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 travel and may also include some adjacent and interspersed non-forested habitats such as emergent wetlands and adjacent edges of agricultural fields, old fields and pastures. This includes forests and woodlots containing potential roosts (i.e., live trees and/or snags  $\geq 3$  inches diameter at breast height (dbh) that have any exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, hollows and/or cavities), as well as linear features such as fencerows, riparian forests, and other wooded corridors. These wooded areas may be dense or loose aggregates of trees with variable amounts of canopy closure. Individual trees may be considered suitable habitat when they exhibit the characteristics of a potential roost tree and are located within 1,000 feet (305 meters) 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 and abandoned mines.

Should the proposed site contain trees 23 inches dbh, we recommend that trees be saved 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 23 inches dbh cannot be avoided, we recommend that removal of any trees 23 inches dbh only occur between October 1 and March 31. Seasonal clearing is being recommended to avoid adverse effects to Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats. While incidental take of northern long-eared bats from most tree clearing is exempted by a 4(d) rule (see <http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/mammals/nleb/index.html>), incidental take of Indiana bats is still prohibited without a project-specific exemption. Thus, seasonal clearing is recommended where Indiana bats are assumed present.

If implementation of this seasonal tree cutting recommendation is not possible, summer surveys may be conducted to document the presence or probable absence of Indiana bats within the project area during the summer. If a summer survey documents probable absence of Indiana bats, the 4(d) rule for the northern long-eared bat could be applied. Surveys must be conducted by an approved surveyor and be designed and conducted in coordination with the Endangered Species Coordinator for this office. Surveyors must have a valid federal permit. Please note that summer surveys may only be conducted between June 1 and August 15.

If there is a federal nexus for the project (e.g., federal funding provided, federal permits required to construct), 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 that 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.

Due to the project type, size, and location, we do not anticipate adverse effects to any other federally endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species. Should the project design change, or during the term of this action, 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, consultation with the Service should be initiated to assess any potential impacts.

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 ESA, and are consistent with the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Service's Mitigation Policy. This letter provides technical assistance only and does not serve as a completed section 7 consultation document. We recommend that the project be coordinated with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources due to the potential for the project to affect state listed species and/or state lands. Contact John Kessler, Environmental Services Administrator, at (614) 2656621 or at [john.kessler@dnr.state.oh.us](mailto:john.kessler@dnr.state.oh.us).

If you have questions, or if we can be of further assistance in this matter, please contact our office at (614) 4168993 [or ohio@fws.gov](mailto:or.ohio@fws.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dan Everson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Dan" being more prominent than the last name "Everson".

Dan Everson

Field Office Supervisor

cc: Nathan Reardon, ODNR-DOW

Jennifer Norris, ODNR-DOW



# Ohio Department of Natural Resources

JOHN R. KASICH, GOVERNOR

JAMES ZEHRINGER, DIRECTOR

## Ohio Division of Wildlife

*Raymond W. Petering, Chief*  
2045 Morse Rd., Bldg. G  
Columbus, OH 43229-6693  
Phone: (614) 265-6300

August 2, 2016

Lynn Gresock  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
2 Lan Drive  
Westford, MA 01886

Dear Ms. Gresock,

After reviewing the Natural Heritage Database, I find the Division of Wildlife has no records of rare or endangered species in the Guernsey Power Station project area, including a one mile radius, in Jackson and Valley Townships, Guernsey County, Ohio. We are unaware of any unique ecological sites, geologic features, animal assemblages, scenic rivers, state wildlife areas, nature preserves, parks or forests, national wildlife refuges, parks or forests or other protected natural areas within a one mile radius of the project area.

Our inventory program has not completely surveyed Ohio and relies on information supplied by many individuals and organizations. Therefore, a lack of records for any particular area is not a statement that rare species or unique features are absent from that area. This letter only represents a review of rare species and natural features data within the Ohio Natural Heritage Database. It does not fulfill coordination under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S. C. 661 et seq.) and does 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.

Please contact me at 614-265-6818 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Debbie Woischke".

Debbie Woischke  
Ohio Natural Heritage Database Program



# Ohio Department of Natural Resources

JOHN R. KASICH, GOVERNOR

JAMES ZEHRINGER, DIRECTOR

**Office of Real Estate**  
*Paul R. Baldridge, Chief*  
2045 Morse Road – Bldg. E-2  
Columbus, OH 43229  
*Phone: (614) 265-6649*  
*Fax: (614) 267-4764*

September 16, 2016

Lynn Gresock  
Tetra Tech Inc.  
661 Anderson Drive  
Pittsburgh, PA 15220

**Re:** 16-558; Threatened and Endangered Species Review Information Request, Guernsey Power Station

**Project:** The proposed project involves the development of a natural gas fired combined cycle electric generating facility.

**Location:** The proposed project is located in Valley Township, Guernsey 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 Natural Heritage Database has no records at or within a one mile radius of the project area.

The Natural Heritage Database has no records within a one mile radius of the project. We are unaware of any unique ecological sites, geologic features, animal assemblages, scenic rivers, state wildlife areas, state nature preserves, state parks or national parks, state or national forests or national wildlife refuges within the project area. The review was performed on the project area you specified in your request as well as an additional one mile radius. Records searched date from 1980 to present.

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. Although all types of plant communities have been surveyed, we only maintain records on the highest quality areas.

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

The DOW recommends that impacts to 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 range of the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), a state endangered and federally endangered species. The following species of trees have relatively high value as potential Indiana bat roost trees to include: shagbark hickory (*Carya ovata*), shellbark hickory (*Carya laciniosa*), bitternut hickory (*Carya cordiformis*), black ash (*Fraxinus nigra*), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), white ash (*Fraxinus americana*), shingle oak (*Quercus imbricaria*), northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), slippery elm (*Ulmus rubra*), American elm (*Ulmus americana*), eastern cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), sassafras (*Sassafras albidum*), post oak (*Quercus stellata*), and white oak (*Quercus alba*). Indiana bat roost trees consists of trees that include dead and dying trees with exfoliating bark, crevices, or cavities in upland areas or riparian corridors and living trees with exfoliating bark, cavities, or hollow areas formed from broken branches or tops. However, Indiana bats are also dependent on the forest structure surrounding roost trees. If suitable habitat occurs within the project area, the DOW recommends trees be conserved. If suitable habitat occurs within the project area and trees must be cut, the DOW recommends cutting occur between October 1 and March 31. If suitable trees must be cut during the summer months, the DOW recommends a net survey be conducted between June 1 and August 15, prior to any cutting. Net surveys should incorporate either nine net nights per square 0.5 kilometer of project area, or four net nights per kilometer for linear projects. If no tree removal is proposed, this project is not likely to impact this species.

This project must not have an impact on freshwater native mussels at the project site. This applies to both listed and non-listed species. Per the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol (2016), all Group 2, 3, and 4 streams (Appendix A) require a mussel survey. Per the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol, Group 1 streams (Appendix A) and unlisted streams with a watershed of 10 square miles or larger above the point of impact should be assessed using the Reconnaissance Survey for Unionid Mussels (Appendix B) to determine if mussels are present. Mussel surveys may be recommended for these streams as well. This is further explained within the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol. Therefore, if in-water work is planned in any stream that meets any of the above criteria, the DOW recommends the applicant provide information to indicate no mussel impacts will occur. If this is not possible, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist conduct a mussel survey in the project area. If mussels that cannot be avoided are found in the project area, as a last resort, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist collect and relocate the mussels to suitable and similar habitat upstream of the project site. Mussel surveys and any subsequent mussel relocation should be done in accordance with the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol. The Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol (2016) can be found at:

<http://wildlife.ohiodnr.gov/portals/wildlife/pdfs/licenses%20&%20permits/OH%20Mussel%20Survey%20Protocol.pdf>

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

The project is within the range of the northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), 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 May 15 to August 1. If this habitat will not be impacted, the project is not likely to impact this species.

The project is within the range of the black bear (*Ursus americanus*), a state endangered species. Due to the mobility of this species, 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 comments.

Based upon the site map identifying the location of the proposed development, the project appears to be located within the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) (i.e., one-percent-annual-chance or 100-year floodplain) of Wills Creek. A local floodplain development permit may be required for this project. For additional information regarding local floodplain management requirements, please contact Guernsey County's designated Floodplain Manager, Mr. Dave Saft at (740) 432-9359 or [dsaft@guernseycounty.org](mailto:dsaft@guernseycounty.org).

ODNR appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments. Please contact John Kessler at (614) 265-6621 if you have questions about these comments or need additional information.

John Kessler  
ODNR Office of Real Estate  
2045 Morse Road, Building E-2  
Columbus, Ohio 43229-6693  
[John.Kessler@dnr.state.oh.us](mailto:John.Kessler@dnr.state.oh.us)



**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**3/16/2017 11:31:03 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 16-2443-EL-BGN**

Summary: Application of Guernsey Power Station, LLC Part 8 - Appendices J Part 2 and K electronically filed by Teresa Orahod on behalf of Sally W. Bloomfield