WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Alaska Region

Project/	Site: Susitna-Watana Hydroelectric Project		Boi	rough/City:	Matanuska	a-Susitna Borough Sampling Date: 24-Aug-15						
Applica	nt/Owner: Alaska Energy Authority					Sampling Point: SW15_T315_07						
	ator(s): EKJ, SCB		La	andform (hill:	side, terrac	e, hummocks etc.): drainage						
Local re	lief (concave, convex, none): hummocky		s	Slope: 7.0	%/ 4.0	U						
	on : Cook Inlet Mountains	Lat				Long.: Datum: WGS84						
		Lui										
	Dunit Name:			Maa		NWI classification: PSS1/EM1B						
	natic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this ti	-		res disturbed?	• No ()	(If no, explain in Remarks.) ormal Circumstances" present? Yes ● No ◯						
			ormal circumstances present?									
Are Ve	egetation 🦳 , Soil 🗌 , or Hydrology 🗌 i	naturall	y prol	blematic?	(If nee	ded, explain any answers in Remarks.)						
SUMN	IARY OF FINDINGS - Attach site map show	wing s	amp	ling point	locations	, transects, important features, etc.						
	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes $oldsymbol{igstar}$ No $igstar$)										
	Hydric Soil Present? Yes Ves No C)		ls	the Sam	npled Area						
	Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes \bigcirc No \bigcirc		within a W			/etland? Yes $ullet$ No $igodoldsymbol{ imes}$						
			do in	variand 1 ft w	ator donth	6 in bottom large angular cabbles, no emergent						
Remarks: small permanent stream along north side, approx 2 ft wide, incised 1 ft, water depth 6 in, bottom large angular cobbles, no emergent vegetation, overhanging tall willows												
VEGE	TATION - Use scientific names of plants. Li	مالحات	noc	ios in tho	nlot							
	bit of the selentine names of plants. El	st an .	spec		piot.	Dominance Test worksheet:						
T	Charles	Absolu % Cov		Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Number of Dominant Species						
1.	Stratum	-70 CU	vei		Status	That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>2</u> (A)						
2.			_			Total Number of Dominant						
3.			_			Species Across All Strata: <u>2</u> (B)						
4.			_			Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)						
5.		_										
0.	Total Cover					Prevalence Index worksheet:						
Sanl	ing/Shrub Stratum 50% of Total Cover:			f Total Cover:	0	Total % Cover of: Multiply by:						
						OBL Species $0 \times 1 = 0$ FACW Species 52.1 $\times 2 = 104.2$						
	Salix pulchra		0		FACW							
	Salix barclayi		0		FAC							
	Dasiphora fruticosa				FAC							
4.		_)									
5.						Column Totals: <u>94.2</u> (A) <u>236.5</u> (B)						
6.)			Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.511						
7.												
0.			_			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ✓ Dominance Test is > 50%						
		(_			✓ Prevalence Index is ≤ 3.0						
10.	Total Cover											
Hert	Stratum 50% of Total Cover:			of Total Cover	12.02	Morphological Adaptations (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)						
1.	Calamagrostis canadensis	2	5	\checkmark	FAC	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation (Explain)						
	Dryopteris expansa		2		FACU	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must						
3.	Streptopus amplexifolius		1		FACU	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.						
4.	Sanguisorba canadensis		1		FACW							
5.	Achillea millefolium		1		FACU	Plot size (radius, or length x width) <u>10m</u>						
6.	Mertensia paniculata		1		FACU	% Cover of Wetland Bryophytes (Where applicable)						
7.	Viola palustris		1		FACW	% Bare Ground						
8.	Rhodiola integrifolia	_	1		FAC	Total Cover of Bryophytes 5						
9.	Chamaenerion angustifolium	_	1		FACU							
10.	Equisetum variegatum	0	.1		FACW	Hydrophytic						
	Total Cover					Vegetation						
	50% of Total Cover: <u>1</u>	7.05	20% oʻ	f Total Cover:	6.82	Present? Tes S NO U						
	Equisetum variegatum Total Cover 50% of Total Cover: _1	0 34 7.05	.1 .1 20% o		FACW 6.82	Vegetation Present? Yes No						

		the depth Matrix	needed to docu	iment the indicator or co	onfirm the at dox Featu		cators)			
Depth (inches)			%	Color (moist)	%	1		Texture	Remarks	
0-1			100			.,,,,,	_ Loc ²	Peat		
1-4	10YR	4/4	100					Sandy Loam		
4-21			100		_			Muck	w some fines. tephra at 10.5"?	
									_	
									-	
¹ Type: C=Con	centration. D	=Depletio	n. RM=Redu	ced Matrix ² Location	n: PL=Poi	e Lining. R	C=Root Cha	annel. M=Matrix		
Hydric Soil In	dicators:			Indicators for P	roblemati	c Hydric S	oils: ³			
✓ Histosol or	Histel (A1)			Alaska Color C	hange (TA	4) ⁴		Alaska Gleyed Without I	Hue 5Y or Redder	
Histic Epipe	Histic Epipedon (A2)				swales (TA	5)	_	Underlying Layer		
Hydrogen S	Sulfide (A4)			Alaska Redox	With 2.5Y	Hue	L	Other (Explain in Rema	rks)	
Thick Dark	Surface (A12	2)		3 One indicator of	budrophy	tia vagatati		non indicator of watland	hudrologu	
Alaska Gley	/ed (A13)			and an appropria				mary indicator of wetland esent	nyarology,	
Alaska Red	. ,			⁴ Give details of c						
Alaska Gley	ed Pores (A1	15)		Give details of c						
Restrictive Laye	r (if present)	:								
Туре:							Hydric Soil Present? Yes $ullet$ No $igodot$			
Depth (inches):										
Remarks:										
Silty sand on or	ganics in soil	pit makes	me think flo	oding?						
HYDROLO	CV									
Wetland Hydr	-	ators:						Secondary Inc	licators (two or more are required)	
Primary Indicat	•••		nt)					Water Stained Leaves (B9)		
Surface Wa				Inundation V	/isible on A	erial Image	erv (B7)	Drainage Patterns (B10)		
High Water Table (A2)			Sparsely Veg		-		Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)			
Saturation (A3)				Marl Deposit			()	Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)		
Water Marks (B1)			Hydrogen Su	ulfide Odor	(C1)		Salt Deposits (C5)			
Sediment Deposits (B2)				Dry-Season				Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)		
Drift Deposits (B3)				Other (Expla	in in Rema	arks)		Geomorphic Position (D2)		
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)								Shallow Aquitard (D3)		
Iron Depos	sits (B5)								graphic Relief (D4)	
Surface So	oil Cracks (B6))					T	FAC-neut	ral Test (D5)	
Field Observa	tions:	,	~ ~							
Surface Water	Present?	Yes (🔾 No 🖲	Depth (inche	es):					

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitor well, aerial photos, previous inspection) if available:

Depth (inches):

Depth (inches): 12

Yes 🔿 No 🖲

Yes

No O

Remarks:

Water Table Present?

(includes capillary fringe)

Saturation Present?

although neither a water table nor a shallow aquitard was observed, this saturation is believed to be related to groundwater discharge (i.e. not episaturation) due to landscape position (drainage), small perennial stream flowing through plot, and thick organic development. D2--geomorphic position.

Wetland Hydrology Present?

Yes 💿 No 🔾