

WETLAND AND FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ASSESSMENT REPORT AND VOLUNTARY BAT HABITAT RESTORATION PLAN

FOUNDER'S RIDGE

NOVEMBER 2021



**Soundview
Consultants**

Environmental Assessment
Planning + Land Use Solutions

WETLAND AND FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ASSESSMENT REPORT AND VOLUNTARY BAT HABITAT RESTORATION PLAN

FOUNDER'S RIDGE

NOVEMBER 3, 2021

PROJECT LOCATION

XXX CENTER DRIVE
DUPONT, WASHINGTON 98327

PREPARED FOR

NORTHPOINT DEVELOPMENT LLC
4825 NORTHWEST 41ST STREET, SUITE 500
RIVERSIDE, MISSOURI 64150

PREPARED BY

SOUNDVIEW CONSULTANTS LLC
2907 HARBORVIEW DRIVE
GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON 98335
(253) 514-8952



**Soundview
Consultants**
Environmental Assessment
Planning + Land Use Solutions

Executive Summary

Soundview Consultants LLC (SVC) is assisting NorthPoint Development LLC (Applicant) with this Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment and Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan for a proposed light manufacturing park located on Center Drive in the City of DuPont, Washington. The project area consists of an approximate 101-acre area on one parcel situated in Sections 26 and 27, Township 19 North, Range 01 East, W.M. (Pierce County Tax Parcel Number 0119272005).

SVC investigated the “study area” (defined as the area within 200 feet of the 101-acre project area) for the presence of potentially regulated wetlands, waterbodies, and other fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas in September 2020 and March 2021. [Features within the project area are referred to as “onsite.”] Using current methodology, the site investigations identified one potentially regulated wetland (Wetland A, commonly known as Old Fort Lake) outside of the project area. Wetland A is classified as a Category III wetland and subject to a standard 75-foot buffer.

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) maps three priority bat species, the big brown bat, little brown bat, and Yuma myotis, in the larger township, a 36-square-mile area. Based on an information request with WDFW, these priority bat species are not documented in the study area (correspondence between SVC and WDFW, November 2020). Site assessments of onsite tree stands by SVC did not identify any habitat for roosting concentrations of bats, and no accumulated piles of bat guano indicative of roosting bats were observed onsite. Due to the lack of documented or observed presence of priority bat species and absence of suitable habitat for roosting concentrations, no fish and wildlife habitat conservation area (FWHCA) associated with priority bat species was identified onsite. Scattered Oregon white oak trees were identified onsite during the tree inventory conducted for the *Certified Arborist Report* provided under separate cover. The Oregon white oaks predominantly occur as individual trees separated by gaps in canopy cover within a Douglas fir dominated forest. The Oregon white oaks do not meet the definition for WDFW priority Oregon white oak woodland as provided in WDFW’s *Management Recommendations for Oregon White Oak Woodlands* (Larsen and Morgan, 1998). No other potentially regulated wetlands, waterbodies, or FWHCAs were identified within the study area.

The Applicant proposes to develop a light manufacturing park to include four buildings and associated parking, access roads, utilities, landscaping, and stormwater detention and treatment facilities. The project was designed to avoid impacts to the identified critical area; all impacts to Wetland A (Old Fort Lake) and its associated buffer are avoided entirely. While there are no priority bat species documented in the study area and the project area currently lacks habitat to support roosting bat concentrations, the general landscape outside of the project area contains aquatic resources (such as Old Fort Lake to the west and Sequelitchew Creek to the north) and associated forest patches that may provide suitable bat habitat. The project area’s proximity to Old Fort Lake offers the opportunity to establish and restore habitat for bat roosting and foraging. As part of the proposed project, the Applicant voluntarily proposes to create a 243,630-square-foot (5.59-acre) bat habitat restoration area. The proposed bat habitat creation actions will target roosting and foraging functions onsite and will consist of installing bat housing; removing non-native, invasive vegetation; planting Douglas fir and quaking aspen [preferred species for roosting]; and planting native shrubs that support bat prey. The proposed voluntary bat habitat restoration plan will create bat habitat adjacent to Wetland A (Old Fort Lake), effectively increasing the size of and improving the quality of bat habitat functions near Old Fort Lake.

The table below summarizes the critical areas and identifies the potential regulatory status by local, state, and federal agencies.

Table 1. Summary of Critical Areas and Regulatory Status

Critical Area	Size Onsite (square feet)	Category¹	Regulated Under DMC Chapter 25.105	Regulated Under RCW 90.48	Regulated Under Clean Water Act
Wetland A (Old Fort Lake)	N/A	III	Yes	Yes	Not Likely

Notes:

1. Current Washington State Department of Ecology (WSDOE) wetland rating methods (Hruby, 2014) and current DMC wetland and waterbody classification guidelines.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Proposed Project	2
2.1 Location.....	2
2.2 Project Description.....	2
Chapter 3. Methods.....	4
Chapter 4. Existing Conditions	5
4.1 Landscape Setting	5
4.2 Soils.....	5
4.3 Vegetation	6
4.4 Wetland, Stream, and Priority Habitats and Species Inventories	6
4.5 Precipitation.....	6
Chapter 5. Results.....	8
5.1 Wetlands.....	8
5.2 Bat Habitat Evaluation.....	8
Chapter 6. Regulatory Considerations	11
6.1 Local Considerations	11
6.2 State and Federal Considerations	12
Chapter 7. Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan	14
7.1 Description of Impacts	14
7.2 Bat Habitat Restoration Strategy	14
7.3 Approach and Best Management Practices.....	15
7.5 Plant Materials and Installation.....	16
7.6 Maintenance Plan.....	18
Chapter 8. Closure.....	19
Chapter 9. References	20

Figures

Figure 1. Vicinity Map.....	2
Figure 2. Aerial View of Project Area	5

Tables

Table 1. Summary of Critical Areas and Regulatory Status.....	ii
Table 2. Precipitation Table ¹	7
Table 3. Wetland Summary	8

Appendices

Appendix A — Methods and Tools
Appendix B — Background Information
Appendix C — Existing Conditions and Proposed Plan Exhibits
Appendix D — Non-Wetland Data Forms

Appendix E — Wetland Rating Form
Appendix F — Wetland Rating Maps
Appendix G— Qualifications

Chapter 1. Introduction

Soundview Consultants LLC (SVC) is assisting NorthPoint Development LLC (Applicant) with this Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment and Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan for a proposed light manufacturing park located on Center Drive in the City of DuPont, Washington. The project area consists of an approximate 101-acre area on one parcel situated in Sections 26 and 27, Township 19 North, Range 01 East, W.M. (Pierce County Tax Parcel Number 0119272005).

The purpose of this report is to identify the presence of potentially regulated wetlands, waterbodies, and other fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas that may be found on or near the project area; assess potential impacts to any such critical areas and/or species from the proposed project; document avoidance and minimization measures; and provide voluntary bat habitat restoration recommendations.

This report provides conclusions and recommendations regarding:

- Site description, project description, and area of assessment;
- Identification and assessment of potentially regulated wetlands and aquatic features located on or near the project area;
- Standard buffer recommendations, building setbacks, and development limitations;
- Existing site map detailing identified critical areas and standard buffers;
- Proposed site plan with proposed development;
- Documentation of impact avoidance and minimization measures;
- Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan providing bat habitat creation measures; and
- Supplemental information necessary for local regulatory review.


Chapter 2. Proposed Project

2.1 Location

The proposed project is located at Center Drive in the City of DuPont, Washington 98327. The project area consists of an approximate 101-acre area on one parcel situated in Sections 26 and 27, Township 19 North, Range 01 East, W.M. (Pierce County Tax Parcel Number 0119272005).

To access the site from the Olympia area, heading northbound on Interstate 5 North, take Exit 118 for Center Drive toward City Center. Continue for 0.5 mile onto Center Drive. The subject property will be on the left after approximately 1.2 miles, across from Palisade Blvd.

Figure 1. Vicinity Map.



2.2 Project Description

The Applicant proposes to develop a light manufacturing park to include four buildings and associated parking, access roads, utilities, landscaping, and stormwater detention and treatment facilities. As part of the proposed project, the Applicant voluntarily proposes to create a 243,630 square-foot (5.59 acre) bat habitat restoration area. The proposed bat habitat creation actions will target roosting and foraging functions onsite and will consist of installing bat housing; removing non-native, invasive vegetation; planting Douglas fir and quaking aspen (preferred species for

roosting); and planting native shrubs that support bat prey. The proposed voluntary bat habitat restoration plan will create bat habitat adjacent to Old Fort Lake, effectively increasing the size of and improving the quality of bat habitat functions near Old Fort Lake.

Chapter 3. Methods

SVC performed a reconnaissance level investigation on September 21, 2020, and formal investigations on March 10 and 11, 2021 to assess wetlands, waterbodies, and other potentially regulated fish and wildlife habitat within the study area. The study area is defined as the proposed project area and areas within 200 feet of the 101-acre project area. All determinations were made using observable vegetation, hydrology, and soils in conjunction with data from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetland Inventory (NWI), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) and SalmonScape mapping tools, Department of Natural Resources (DNR) water typing system, Pierce County's Geographic Information System (GIS) data, local precipitation data, and various orthophotographic resources. Appendix A contains further details for the methods and tools used to prepare this report.

Wetland presence or absence was determined in accordance with Dupont Municipal Code (DMC) 25.105.050(1) and as outlined in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) *Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory, 1987) as modified according to the guidelines established in the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region, Version 2.0* (USACE, 2010) and *Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States* (USDA, 2018). Pink surveyor's flagging was labeled alpha-numerically and tied to 3-foot lath or vegetation at formal sampling locations to mark the points where detailed data were collected in the project area (DP-1 to DP-15). Additional test pits were excavated at regular intervals to further confirm wetland absence in the project area.

Wetlands were classified using both the hydrogeomorphic (Brinson, 1993) and Cowardin (Cowardin, 1979; Federal Geographic Data Committee, 2013) classification systems. Following classification and assessment, all wetlands were rated and categorized using the *Washington State Wetlands Rating System for Western Washington – Washington State Department of Ecology* (WSDOE) *Publication No. 14-06-029, published October 2014* (Hruby, 2014) and guidelines established in DMC 25.105.050(1).

The fish and wildlife habitat assessment was conducted during the same site visit by qualified fish and wildlife biologists. The experienced biologists made visual observations using stationary and walking survey methods for both aquatic and upland habitats noting any special habitat features or signs of fish and wildlife activity. The potential for onsite bat roosting habitat was evaluated by walking survey of tree stands and examination of individual tree data provided with the *Certified Arborist Report* under separate cover. The WDFW *Bat Conservation Plan* (Hayes and Wiles, 2013) was utilized as general guidance for the bat habitat assessment.

Chapter 4. Existing Conditions

4.1 Landscape Setting

The project area is located in a mixed residential and commercial area within the City of DuPont and currently consists of undeveloped forest (Figure 2). The project area abuts undeveloped forest and a golf course to the north, Center Drive and residential areas to the east, residential neighborhoods and the golf course to the south, and a golf course with undeveloped areas and Puget Sound beyond to west. Site topography generally slopes downward from the far west corner to the east towards Old Fort Lake, with elevations ranging from approximately 209 feet above mean sea level (amsl) by the lake to approximately 297 feet amsl on the western corner of the site (Appendix B1). The site is located within Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 12 – Chambers - Clover.

Figure 2. Aerial View of Project Area



4.2 Soils

The NRCS web soil survey identifies one soil series in the project area: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam (Appendix B2). A detailed soil description is provided below:

Spanaway gravelly sandy loam (41A)

The Spanaway series consist of somewhat excessively drained soils formed from gravelly outwash mixed in the upper part with volcanic ash on the plain from Lakewood to Roy. In a typical profile, the surface layer (0 to 14 inches) is black gravelly sandy loam. The subsoil (14 to 18 inches) is dark grayish brown very gravelly sandy loam. The substratum, to a depth of greater than 60 inches, is light brownish gray very gravelly sand. The Spanaway gravelly sandy loam is not listed as hydric on the Pierce County Soils List. (NRCS, 2020).

4.3 Vegetation

Upland vegetation onsite consists of undeveloped forest with a canopy dominated by Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) and an understory dominated by Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*), common St. Johnswort (*Hypericum perforatum*), and colonial bentgrass (*Agrostis capillaris*). Other species throughout the project area include western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), Oregon white oak (*Quercus garryana*), Pacific madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), tall Oregon grape (*Mahonia aquifolium*), non-native invasive species butterfly bush (*Buddleja davidii*) and Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), and hairy cat's ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*).

4.4 Wetland, Stream, and Priority Habitats and Species Inventories

The Pierce County Stream and Wetland Inventory (Appendix B3), USFWS NWI map (Appendix B4), and WDFW PHS map (Appendix B5) identify one potential wetland on the northeast corner of the project area, and one potential wetland offsite within the study area. WDFW and USFWS identify the onsite wetland as a freshwater emergent wetland, and the offsite wetland as a lake (referred to as Old Fort Lake). Pierce County, USFWS, and the DNR Stream Typing map (Appendix B6) also identify a potential offsite stream associated with the lake within the study area. The DNR Stream Typing Map classifies this stream as a Type N (non-fish habitat) stream.

The WDFW PHS map identifies potential waterfowl concentrations within Old Fort Lake. Little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*), big brown bat (*Eptesicus fuscus*), and Yuma myotis (*Myotis yumanensis*) are documented in the township, an approximately 36-square-mile area, but not necessarily within the project study area. The WDFW SalmonScape map (Appendix B7) does not identify any potential salmonids within the study area. The FEMA Floodplain Map (Appendix B8) identifies a 100-year floodplain offsite within the study area, associated with Old Fort lake. No other wetlands, waterbodies, or fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas are documented on or within 200 feet of the project area.

4.5 Precipitation

Precipitation data was obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Weather Service (NWS) weather station at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport in order to acquire precipitation values during and preceding the field investigation. A summary of data collected is provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Precipitation Table¹

Date	Day Of	Day Before	1 Week Prior	2 Weeks Prior	Last 30 Days (Observed/Normal)	Year-to-Date² (Observed/Normal)	Percent of Normal (last 30 days/year)
9/21/2020	0.00	0.07	0.46	0.46	0.49/1.30	24.49/21.53	38/114
3/10/2021	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.88	3.56/3.81	28.73/25.72	93/112
3/11/2021	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.87	3.56/3.80	28.73/25.84	94/111

Notes:

1. Precipitation levels provided in inches. Data obtained from the NOAA (<http://w2.weather.gov/climate/xmacis.php?wfo=sew>) for Seattle-Tacoma international airport.
2. Year-to-date precipitation for the September 2020 site visit is for the calendar year of January 1st to the onsite date; year-to-date precipitation for the March 2021 site visit is the total for the 2020/2021 water year from October 1st, 2020 to the onsite date.

Precipitation levels during the September 2020 site investigation were below the statistical normal for the prior 30 days (38 percent of normal) and within the statistical normal for the calendar year (114 percent of normal). Precipitation levels during the March 2021 site investigation were within the statistical normal for the prior 30 days (93 and 94 percent of normal) and for the 2020/2021 water year. This precipitation data suggests that conditions were relatively normal during the time of the site investigations. Such conditions were considered in making professional wetland determinations.

Chapter 5. Results

The site investigations in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 identified one potentially regulated wetland (Wetland A) offsite. No other potentially regulated wetlands, waterbodies, or FWHCAs were identified within 200 feet of the subject property during the site investigation.

5.1 Wetlands

5.1.1 Overview

No wetlands were identified within the project area. Wetland A (Old Fort Lake) was identified offsite within the study area. The identified offsite wetland contained indicators of wetland hydrology, hydric soils (presumed), and a predominance of hydrophytic vegetation according to current wetland delineation methodology. Data forms are provided in Appendix D; the wetland rating form is provided in Appendix E; and wetland rating maps are provided in Appendix F. Table 3 summarizes the wetland identified offsite during the site investigation.

Table 3. Wetland Summary

Wetland	Predominant Wetland Classification / Rating				Wetland Size Onsite (square ft)	Buffer Width (feet) ⁴
	Cowardin ¹	HGM ²	WSDOE ³	Habitat Score		
Offsite A (Old Fort Lake)	PEM/ABBCH	Depressional	III	5	N/A (Offsite)	75

Notes:

1. Cowardin et al. (1979) and Federal Geographic Data Committee (2013) or NWI Class based on vegetation: PAB = Aquatic Bed; PEM = Palustrine Emergent. Modifiers for Water Regime: B = Seasonally Saturated; C = Seasonally Flooded; H = Permanently Flooded.
2. Brinson, M. M. (1993).
3. Current WSDOE Rating System for Western Washington (Hruby, 2014).
4. DMC 25.105.050(1)(b) for wetland buffer requirements.

Offsite Wetland A (Old Fort Lake)

Offsite Wetland A (commonly known as Old Fort Lake) is located offsite to the west of the project area. Hydrology for Wetland A is provided by a high groundwater table, direct precipitation, and surface runoff from adjacent uplands. Vegetation in Wetland A is dominated by redosier dogwood (*Cornus alba*), hardhack (*Spiraea douglasii*), reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), and bulrush (*Scirpoides holoschoenus*). Per DMC 25.105.050(1)(a), Wetland A is a Category III depressional wetland.

5.2 Bat Habitat Evaluation

This habitat evaluation focuses on the onsite habitat potential for big brown bat, little brown bat, and Yuma myotis. WDFW maps these priority species in the township, a 36-square-mile area; however, no priority species are documented by WDFW onsite (information request from SVC to WDFW, November 2020). The regional landscape surrounding the study area consists of urban residential development, commercial development, relatively large forest patches, and several mapped aquatic resources (e.g. lakes, marshes, and streams). This larger landscape likely provides suitable habitat for bats; however, potential habitat in the study area is limited by the existing tree conditions and presence of non-native, invasive shrub vegetation.

The WDFW *Bat Conservation Plan* states that the most important habitats for Washington's bats are those used for roosting and foraging (Hayes and Wiles 2103):

5.2.1 Roosting Habitat

Big brown bat, little brown bat, and Yuma myotis are known to roost communally in trees, buildings, bridges, and other structures. As no buildings, bridges, or manmade structures are present in the project area, the only potential roosting habitat on site consists of trees. Preferred roosting habitat typically consists of trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 50 centimeters or more, height of 18 meters or taller, and evidence of decay (Hayes and Wiles, 2013). Preferred roosting locations within these trees include cavities and crevices and exfoliating bark; accessibility and sun exposure are also important criteria for roost selection. Preferred tree species include Douglas fir, quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), and ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*).

Tree stands are located in the southeastern corner of the study area. The tree stands consist primarily of Douglas firs with interspersed Oregon white oak individuals and sparse big-leaf maples, black cottonwood, shore pine, and red oak individuals. No quaking aspen or ponderosa pine have been identified onsite. While Douglas firs are a preferred roosting species for the bats, communal roosting habitat for bats is currently absent onsite. The Douglas fir trees in the study area generally do not display the decay characteristics that create roosting habitat, are surrounded by other trees and lack sun exposure, or are smaller than the preferred roosting tree size. No accumulated piles of bat guano that would be indicative of roosting bat concentrations were observed onsite.

It is important to note that while an individual tree may provide preferred roosting habitat, the surrounding habitat is also important. Bats typically show a preference to older forest with high basal diameters and a high density of snags. Proximity to food and water resources is also an important consideration. While the tree stands contain larger individual trees, the assessed tree stands contains approximately 1 snag per acre, which is not especially rich with snags. The nearest water sources are Wetland A (Old Fort Lake) and Sequelitchew Creek. These water sources are at least 1,000 feet away from the tree stands on the southeastern portion of the study area. As described below, onsite habitat provides marginal resources for bat prey. Much larger, less disturbed stands of trees are present approximately 0.5 kilometer to the north along Sequelitchew Creek, and approximately 1.75 kilometers to the south; these areas are more likely to provide preferred individual roost trees and preferred habitat surrounding the roosts.

5.2.2 Foraging Habitat

The big brown bat, little brown bat, and Yuma myotis are all insectivores. The little brown bat and Yuma myotis rely heavily on aquatic insects as their main prey source but will also forage for less water-dependent species such as moths, termites, and beetles. Big brown bats rely primarily on larger, heavier-bodied prey such as beetles. The little brown bat and Yuma myotis are capable of foraging in more cluttered environments such as below the forest canopy, whereas big brown bats have less maneuverability and are more typically found foraging above the forest canopy and in clearings.

The study area consists of forested and cleared areas that are dominated by an understory of Douglas fir saplings, Scotch broom, salal, Oregon grape, and western swordfern. These areas generally lack native deciduous shrub or herbaceous species that are typically required for many of the bats' preferred prey species. Therefore, the existing study area conditions generally lack suitable habitat for bat prey species. All three bat species are known to travel several kilometers each night

for their preferred foraging habitats. Offsite freshwater aquatic resources within a few kilometers of the study area may support bat foraging; these resources include open water (Wetland A/Old Fort Lake) immediately west of the study area and a stream (Sequalitchew Creek) to the north. No aquatic resources are present in the project area, and any bat prey use of the study area is likely concentrated in areas near the offsite Wetland A (Old Fort Lake).

Chapter 6. Regulatory Considerations

The results of the SVC site investigations identified one wetland (Wetland A/Old Fort Lake) outside of the project area. No other potentially regulated wetlands, waterbodies, or FWHCAs were identified on or near the subject property.

6.1 Local Considerations

6.1.1 Wetlands

DMC 25.105.050(1)(a) has adopted the current WSDOE (2014) wetland rating system. Category III wetlands generally provide moderate levels of function, have typically been disturbed in some ways, and are often less diverse and/or more isolated in the landscape than Category II wetlands. Category III wetlands score 16 – 19 out of 27 points on the *Revised Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington* (Hruby, 2014).

The offsite Wetland A (Old Fort Lake) is a Category III depressional wetland that requires a standard 75-foot buffer width per DMC 25.105.050(1)(b). The proposed project will avoid impacts to the offsite Wetland A and the associated buffer.

6.1.2 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

No Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (FWHCAs) were identified in the study area as detailed below.

WDFW PHS Mapped Priority Bat Species

WDFW Priority Habitats and Species are regulated as FWHCAs under DMC 25.105.030.140(b). The WDFW PHS program classifies roosting concentrations of three local bat species (big brown bat, little brown bat, and Yuma myotis) as priority species (WDFW, 2021). WDFW maps big brown bat, little brown bat, and Yuma myotis within the township, a 36-square-mile area. However, these priority species are not documented in the study area as confirmed by WDFW (correspondence between SVC and WDFW, November 2020) nor were roosting concentrations observed by SVC (see analysis in Section 5.2.1 above). SVC's site assessment identified a lack of onsite habitat that would support regular concentrations or communal roosts of bats. The project area therefore should not be regulated as a FWHCA.

While there are no priority bat species documented on the subject property, the project area is located in a regional landscape that contains aquatic resources and large forest patches that may provide suitable bat habitat outside the project limits. Therefore, as part of the proposed project, the Applicant voluntarily proposes to create a bat habitat restoration area to create bat roosting and foraging habitat onsite in general proximity to Wetland A (Old Fort Lake) and the surrounding landscape. A voluntary bat habitat restoration plan is provided in Chapter 7.

Oregon White Oaks

A total of 49 Oregon white oaks were identified and assessed in the 101-acre project area. Most of the oaks were growing individually, with a few clustered together or within stands.

The definition for priority Oregon white oak woodlands is provided in WDFW's *Management Recommendations for Oregon White Oak Woodlands* (Larsen and Morgan, 1998), which is closely adhered to by the City of DuPont.

Priority Oregon white oak woodlands are stands of pure oak or oak/conifer associations where canopy coverage of the oak component of the stand is $\geq 25\%$; or where total canopy coverage of the stand is $< 25\%$, but oak accounts for at least 50% of the canopy coverage present. The latter is often referred to as an oak savanna. In non-urbanized areas west of the Cascades, priority oak habitat is stands ≥ 0.4 ha (1 ac) in size. East of the Cascades, priority oak habitat is stands ≥ 2 ha (5 ac) in size. In urban or urbanizing areas, single oaks, or stands of oaks < 0.4 ha (1 ac), may also be considered priority habitat when found to be particularly valuable to fish and wildlife (i.e., they contain many cavities, have a large DBH, are used by priority species, or have a large canopy).

The Oregon white oaks predominantly occur as individual trees separated by gaps in canopy cover within a Douglas fir dominated forest. None of the oak stands are greater than 1 acre as verified by SVC's detailed tree assessment and *Certified Arborist Report* provided under separate cover. Canopy coverage of the oak component of the stand does not exceed 25 percent.

All but one oak was assessed as being in fair to good condition. Oregon white oaks are phototrophic in nature, extending their branches away from the dense persistent shade of the Douglas fir trees and arching toward patches of sunlight. Structural deficiencies such as these severely arching lead and lateral branches detracted from their overall condition rating. However, aside from these structural deficiencies, the oaks did not present opportunities for improved wildlife habitat such as broken tops, splits, breaks or cavities. No significant dead branches over 2 inches in diameter, nesting cavities or bat roosting habitat (vertical cavities 20 inches or greater in the upper oak canopy) were observed. No potentially regulated wetlands or streams were identified in the project area. The general site conditions do not support habitat conditions for priority species and no priority species (e.g., western gray squirrel) are known to be associated with the project area or were observed during site investigations.

Due to the relatively small number of oaks, the low density of oaks in the coniferous tree stands, and lack of valuable wildlife habitat features, the onsite Oregon white oak trees do not meet the description of a priority Oregon white oak woodland (Larsen and Morgan, 1998), and none should be considered a regulated FWHCA under DMC 25.105.050.

6.2 State and Federal Considerations

On February 28, 2017, an Executive Order, "Restoring the Rule of Law, Federalism, and Economic Growth by Reviewing the 'Waters of the United States Rule'" was issued to require the EPA and USACE to review or rescind the Clean Water Rule published in the Federal Register on June 29, 2015. The 2015 Clean Water Rule was rescinded in October 2019 and is no longer effective as of December 23, 2019 as described in the Federal Register (USACE and EPA, 2019). The Federal Register published "The Navigable Waters Protection Rule: Definition of 'Waters of the United

States” on April 21, 2020. The Navigable Waters Protection Rule is the second step in reviewing and revising the definition of WOTUS as intended by the Executive Order “Restoring the Rule of Law, Federalism, and Economic Growth by Reviewing the ‘Waters of the United States Rule.’” The Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) became effective June 22, 2020.

Under the final NWPR, the agencies interpret the term WOTUS to encompass: 1) the territorial seas and traditional navigable waters; 2) perennial and intermittent tributaries that contribute surface water flow to such waters; 3) certain lakes, ponds, and impoundments of jurisdictional waters; and 4) wetlands adjacent to other jurisdictional waters.

The NWPR specifies that WOTUS do not include: a) groundwater, including groundwater drained through subsurface drainage systems; b) ephemeral features that flow only in direct response to precipitation, including ephemeral streams, swales, gullies, rills, and pools; c) diffuse stormwater runoff and directional sheet flow over upland; d) ditches that are not traditional navigable waters, tributaries, or that are not constructed in adjacent wetlands, subject to certain limitations; e) prior converted cropland; f) artificially irrigated areas that would revert to upland if artificial irrigation ceases; g) artificial lakes and ponds that are not jurisdictional impoundments and that are constructed or excavated in upland or non-jurisdictional waters; h) water-filled depressions constructed or excavated in upland or in non-jurisdictional waters incidental to mining or construction activity, and pits excavated in upland or in non-jurisdictional waters for the purpose of obtaining fill, sand, or gravel; i) stormwater control features constructed or excavated in upland or in non-jurisdictional waters to convey, treat, infiltrate, or store stormwater runoff; j) groundwater recharge, water reuse, and wastewater recycling structures constructed or excavated in upland or in non-jurisdictional waters; and k) waste treatment systems.

The offsite Wetland A is an isolated feature with no known surface connection to Waters of the United States, and, as such, is not likely regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Wetland A is, however, likely regulated by the WSDOE under RCW 90.48, which protects surface waters of the state. The proposed light manufacturing development avoids all impacts to the identified wetland. As such, authorizations from the USACE under Section 404 of the CWA or WSDOE under RCW 90.48 will not be required.

Chapter 7. Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan

The following bat habitat restoration plan is voluntarily provided by the Applicant to establish bat habitat onsite. The intent of this voluntary bat habitat restoration plan is to create suitable bat roosting and foraging habitat onsite in support of bat conservation objectives in urbanizing environments. The proposed voluntary bat habitat restoration plan is generally designed based on WDFW bat habitat recommendations (Hayes and Wiles, 2013).

7.1 Description of Impacts

Vegetation onsite consist of tree stands and scrub-shrub communities that do not provide communal roosting habitat for bats. No aquatic resources are present on the subject property, and the onsite vegetation communities generally lack native deciduous shrub or herbaceous species that are typically required for many of the bats' preferred prey species. Tree stands are located in the southeastern portion of the project area; non-native dominated scrub-shrub communities are located in the northern and western portions of the project area. The proposed project requires that the majority of the tree stands be cleared in order to meet the large spatial requirements of the proposed business park. A site plan is provided in Appendix C.

7.2 Bat Habitat Restoration Strategy

To improve bat habitat conditions onsite, the Applicant proposes to restore 243,630 square feet (5.59 acres) of degraded habitat onsite. This voluntary bat habitat restoration area will provide contiguous vegetative cover with the vegetation surrounding Wetland A (Old Fort Lake), effectively increasing the size and improving the quality of this habitat patch. Vegetation in the proposed bat habitat restoration area is currently dominated by Douglas fir saplings and non-native, invasive species, primarily Scotch broom.

The proposed bat habitat restoration strategy is intended to support bat roosting and foraging habitat onsite, in general proximity to offsite aquatic features (Old Fort Lake), through the provision of roosting structures, planting of native preferred roosting trees, and planting of native vegetation associated with bat prey. Bat housing will be installed to provide roosting opportunities for bats. The installation of bat boxes will provide potential roosting habitat that can accommodate small to medium sized maternity colonies. Bats roost in urban areas, and the bat housing will provide an immediate opportunity for bats to roost in the area near Wetland A (Old Fort Lake). To support roosting and foraging habitat, non-native, invasive species will be removed. Long-term roosting habitat will be provided throughout the bat habitat restoration area by creating tree canopies dominated by preferred roosting tree species (i.e. Douglas fir and quaking aspen). Existing Douglas fir saplings will be thinned to allow for future tree growth and native understory plantings; additional Douglas fir trees may be planted to ensure a more consistent density of trees across the site. Quaking aspens will be planted along the primary access road, providing a dense screen between the road and the interior portions of the bat habitat restoration area. These trees will also provide roosting habitat [quaking aspen is a preferred roosting tree for big brown bats and little brown bats] and provide a food source for prey species. Deciduous shrubs will be planted throughout the bat habitat restoration area to provide a food source for common prey items including moths, beetles, and flies. Proposed shrub species have been selected to attract bat prey. The proposed bat habitat restoration area will mature over time, transitioning from a relatively open shrub-scrub habitat into a

diverse, native forested habitat. This area will initially be relatively open and provide foraging habitat for big brown bats. As the trees mature and the area transitions into a forest, the understory canopy may be utilized by little brown bats and Yuma myotis if present, which can maneuver more cluttered environments, and big brown bats may continue to forage over the forest canopy. As the Douglas fir and quaking aspen trees mature, they will also develop into preferred roosting habitat.

The proposed voluntary bat habitat restoration strategy will result in a net gain of habitat functions supporting bats onsite. The proposed bat habitat restoration actions include, but may not be limited to, the following recommendations and will be implemented according to the plans provided in Appendix C:

- Install bat houses along the edge of the habitat restoration areas. Bat houses will be installed according to the following design recommendations:
 - Roughen bat house interiors to ensure grip;
 - Paint bat houses black and install with a south to southeastern exposure to ensure proper microclimate,
 - Install bat houses to ensure the entrances are accessible and not impeded by branches or debris,
 - Install bat houses a minimum of 15 feet above the ground.
- Remove non-native, invasive vegetation across the restoration area;
- Thin out existing Douglas fir saplings to approximately 16 feet on center;
- Plant quaking aspen and Douglas firs in temporarily impacted areas adjacent to interior access road and parking areas;
- Plant deciduous shrubs species known to be utilized by various prey species across the restoration area;
- Maintain and control invasive plants annually, at a minimum, or more frequently if necessary. Maintenance to reduce the growth and spread of invasive plants is not restricted to chemical applications but may include hand removal, if warranted;
- Provide dry-season irrigation if necessary to ensure native plant survival;
- Direct exterior lights away from the voluntary habitat restoration area wherever feasible.

7.3 Approach and Best Management Practices

The proposed voluntary restoration plan is intended to improve bat habitat within the project and overall study area. Restoration of habitat should occur immediately after grading is complete. TESC measures will be implemented such as high-visibility fencing (HVF) installed around native vegetation to be preserved, silt fencing between the graded areas and undisturbed habitat, plastic sheeting on stockpiled materials, and seeding of disturbed soils. These TESC measures should be installed prior to the start of development or restoration actions and actively managed for the duration of the project.

All equipment staging and materials stockpiles should be kept out of the identified critical areas and buffers, and the area will need to be kept free of spills and/or hazardous materials. All fill material and road surfacing should be sourced from upland areas onsite or from approved suppliers and will need to be free of pollutants and hazardous materials. Construction materials along with all construction waste and debris should be effectively managed and stockpiled on paved surfaces and kept free of the remaining critical areas and associated buffers. Following completion of the

development, the entire site should be cleaned and detail graded wherever necessary, and TESC measures will need to be removed.

7.5 Plant Materials and Installation

7.5.1 Plant Materials

All plant materials to be used for the restoration actions will be nursery grown stock from a reputable, local source. Only native species are to be used; no hybrids or cultivars will be allowed. Plant material provided will be typical of their species or variety; if not cuttings they will exhibit normal, densely developed branches and vigorous, fibrous root systems. Plants will be sound, healthy, vigorous plants free from defects, and all forms of disease and infestation.

Container stock shall have been grown in its delivery container for not less than six months but not more than two years. Plants shall not exhibit rootbound conditions. Under no circumstances shall container stock be handled by their trunks, stems, or tops. Seed mixture used for hand or hydroseeding shall contain fresh, clean, and new crop seed mixed by an approved method. The mixture is specified in the plan set.

All plant material should be inspected by a qualified Project Biologist upon delivery. Plant material not conforming to the specifications below will be rejected and replaced by the planting contractor. Rejected plant materials shall be immediately removed from the site.

Fertilizer will be in the form of Agroform plant tabs or an approved like form. Mulch or coir rings may be installed around woody vegetation as determined to be necessary for plant survivability by the landscaper.

7.5.2 Plant Scheduling, Species, Density, and Location

Plant installation should occur as close to conclusion of clearing and grading activities as possible to limit erosion and limit the temporal loss of function provided by the onsite habitat. All plantings should occur between September 1 and May 1 to ensure plants do not dry out after installation, or temporary irrigation measures may be necessary. All plantings will be installed according to the procedures detailed in the following subsections and as outlined on the site plans in Appendix C.

7.5.3 Quality Control for Planting Plan

All plant material should be inspected by the Project Biologist upon delivery. Plant material not conforming to the specifications above will be rejected and replaced by the planting contractor. Rejected plant materials shall be immediately removed from the site. Under no circumstances shall container stock be handled by their trunks, stems, or tops.

The landscape contractor should provide the Project Biologist with documentation of plant material that includes the supplying nursery contact information, location of genetic source, plant species, plant quantities, and plant sizes.

7.5.4 Product Handling, Delivery, and Storage

All seed should be delivered in original, unopened, and undamaged containers showing weight, analysis, and name of manufacturer. This material should be stored in a manner to prevent wetting and deterioration. All precautions customary in good trade practice shall be taken in preparing plants for moving. Workmanship that fails to meet industry standards will be rejected. Plants will

be packed, transported, and handled with care to ensure protection against injury and from drying out. If plants cannot be planted immediately upon delivery they should be protected with soil, wet peat moss, or in a manner acceptable to the Project Biologist. Plants and mulch not installed immediately upon delivery shall be secured on the site to prevent theft or tampering. No plant shall be bound with rope or wire in a manner that could damage or break the branches. Plants transported on open vehicles should be secured with a protective covering to prevent windburn.

7.5.5 Preparation and Installation of Plant Materials

The planting contractor shall verify the location of all elements of the habitat enhancement plan with the responsible Project Biologist prior to installation. The responsible Project Biologist reserves the right to adjust the locations of landscape elements during the installation period as appropriate. If obstructions are encountered that are not shown on the drawings, planting operations will cease until alternate plant locations have been selected by and/or approved by the Project Biologist.

Circular plant pits with vertical sides will be excavated for all container stock. The pits should be at least 1.5 times the width of the rootball, and the depth of the pit should accommodate the entire root system. Please refer to planting detail in Appendix C.

Broken roots should be pruned with a sharp instrument and rootballs should be thoroughly soaked prior to installation. Set plant material upright in the planting pit to proper grade and alignment. Water plants thoroughly midway through backfilling and add Agroform tablets or similar. Water pits again upon completion of backfilling. No filling should occur around trunks or stems. Do not use frozen or muddy mixtures for backfilling. Form a ring of soil around the edge of each planting pit to retain water, and install a 4- to 6-inch layer of mulch around the base of each container plant if determined to be necessary by the landscape contractor.

Topsoil, mulch, compost, or other amendments may be installed to ensure plant survivability at the discretion of the landscaper.

7.5.6 Temporary Irrigation Specifications

While the native species selected for the habitat restoration actions are hardy and typically thrive in northwest conditions and the proposed actions are planned in areas with sufficient hydroperiods for the species selected, some individual plants might perish due to dry conditions. Therefore, irrigation or regular watering may be provided as necessary for the duration of the first two growing seasons, two times per week while the native plantings become established. If used, irrigation will be discontinued after two growing seasons. Frequency and amount of irrigation will be dependent upon climatic conditions and may require more or less frequency watering than two times per week.

7.5.7 Invasive Plant Control and Removal

Invasive species to be removed include Himalayan blackberry, Scotch broom, and all listed noxious weeds. To ensure non-native invasive species do not expand following the habitat restoration actions, non-native invasive plants within the entire mitigation area will be pretreated with a root-killing herbicide approved for use in aquatic sites (i.e. Rodeo) a minimum of two weeks prior to being cleared and grubbed from the restoration areas. A second application is strongly recommended. The pre-treatment with herbicide should occur prior to all planned restoration actions, and spot treatment of surviving non-native invasive vegetation should be performed again each fall prior to senescence for a minimum of five years.

7.6 Maintenance Plan

The Applicant is committed to compliance with the habitat restoration plan and overall success of the project. As such, the Applicant will continue to maintain the project, keeping the site free from non-native invasive vegetation, trash, and yard waste. Depending on the success of the habitat restoration site, maintenance frequency may be decreased or increased at the discretion of the responsible Project Biologist.

Due to the voluntary nature of the restoration actions, formal monitoring is not warranted or proposed.

Maintenance activities may include, but are not limited to:

1. Replacing plants lost to vandalism, drought, or disease, as necessary;
2. Replacing any plant species with a 20 percent or greater mortality rate after two growing seasons with the same species or native species of similar form and function;
3. Irrigating the mitigation areas only as necessary during dry weather if plants appear to be too dry, with a minimal quantity of water;
4. Reseeding and/or repair of habitat areas as necessary if erosion or sedimentation occurs;
5. Spot treat non-native invasive plant species;
6. Maintenance and/or relocation of bat houses if needed; and
7. Removing all trash or undesirable debris from the habitat areas as necessary.

Chapter 8. Closure

The findings and conclusions documented in this report have been prepared for specific application to the Founder's Ridge project. These findings and conclusions have been developed in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill normally exercised by members of the environmental science profession currently practicing under similar conditions in the area. The conclusions and recommendations presented in this assessment report are professional opinions based on an interpretation of information currently available to us and are made within the operation scope, budget, and schedule of this project. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made. In addition, changes in government codes, regulations, or laws may occur. Due to such changes, our observations and conclusions applicable to this assessment may need to be revised wholly or in part in the future.

Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, wetland status and boundaries identified by SVC are based on conditions present at the time of the site visits and considered preliminary until the fish and wildlife habitat conservation area presence and estimated wetland boundaries are validated by the jurisdictional agencies. Validation of wetland boundaries and jurisdictional status of such features by the regulatory agencies provides a certification, usually written, that the wetland determination and boundaries verified are the units that will be regulated by the agencies until a specific date or until the regulations are modified. Only the regulatory agencies can provide this certification.

As fish and wildlife habitats, wetlands and waterbodies are dynamic communities affected by both natural and human activities, changes in boundaries or conditions may be expected; therefore, delineations and existing habitat conditions cannot remain valid for an indefinite period of time. Regulatory agencies typically recognize the validity of existing conditions and wetland delineations for a period of 5 years after completion of an assessment report. Development activities on a site five years after the completion of this assessment report may require reassessment of the current habitat conditions and/or wetland boundaries. In addition, changes in government codes, regulations, or laws may occur. Due to such changes, our observations and conclusions applicable to this site may need to be revised wholly or in part if a significant period of time passes from the date of this report until the planned site improvements are undertaken.

Chapter 9. References

- Brinson, M. M. 1993. *A hydrogeomorphic classification for wetlands*, Technical Report WRP-DE-4. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. Vicksburg, Mississippi.
- Cowardin, L.M. V. Carter, F. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Washington D.C.
- DuPont Municipal Code (DMC). 2021. *Chapter 25.105 – Critical Areas*. Website: <https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/DuPont/#!/DuPont25/DuPont25105.html#25.105.030>. Current through October 27, 2020.
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1*, US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.
- Federal Geographic Data Committee. 2013. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. FGDC-STD-004-2013. Second Edition. Wetlands Subcommittee, Federal Geographic Data Committee and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.
- Hayes, G. and G. J. Wiles. 2013. *Washington Bat Conservation Plan*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington. 138+viii pp.
- Hitchcock, C.L. & A. Cronquist, Ed. by D. Giblin, B. Ledger, P. Zika, and R. Olmstead. 2018. *Flora of the Pacific Northwest, 2nd Edition*. U.W. Press and Burke Museum. Seattle, Washington.
- Hruby, T. 2014. *Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington – Revised*. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication # 14-06-29. Olympia, WA.
- Larsen, E. M., and J. T. Morgan. 1998. *Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Habitats: Oregon White Oak Woodlands*. Wash. Dept. Fish and Wildlife; Olympia, Washington. 37pp.
- Munsell® Color, 2000. *Munsell® Soil Color Charts*. New Windsor, New York.
- Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS). N.d. *Soil Data Access Hydric Soils List (Soil Data Access Live)*. Website: https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcseprd1316620.html.
- NRCS. 2018. *Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 8.2*. L.M. Vasilas, G.W. Hurt, and J.F. Berkowitz (eds.). USDA, NRCS, in cooperation with the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils
- Sheldon, D., T. Hruby, P. Johnson, K. Harper, A. McMillan, T. Granger, S. Stanley, and E. Stockdale. 2005. *Wetlands in Washington State - Volume 1: A Synthesis of the Science*. Washington State Department of Ecology. Publication #05-06-006. Olympia, Washington. March 2005.
- Soundview Consultants LLC (SVC). 2021. *Certified Arborist Report*. November 3, 2021.

- U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2010. *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (Ver2.0)*, ed. J.S. Wakeley, R.W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-10-3. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. Vicksburg, Mississippi:
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2018. *National Wetland Plant List, version 3.4*. <http://wetland-plants.usace.army.mil/>.
- USACE and EPA. 2020. The Navigable Waters Protection Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States,” 85 Fed. Reg. 77 (April 21, 2020) (codified at 33 CFR Pt. 328 and 40 C.F.R. Pt. 110, 112, 116, 117, 120, 230, 232, 300, 302, and 401).
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), NRCS. 2010. *Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 8.2*. L.M. Vasialas, G.W. Hurt, and C.V. Noble (eds.). USDA, NRCS, in cooperation with the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils.
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2021. *Priority Habitats and Species List*. Updated February 2021.

Appendix A — Methods and Tools

Table A-1. Methods and Tools Used to Prepare the Report.


Parameter	Method or Tool	Website	Reference
Wetland Delineation	USACE 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual	http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/elpubs/pdf/wlman87.pdf	Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1, US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.
	Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region	http://www.usace.army.mil/cw/cecwo/reg/inte_aridwest_sup.pdf	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2010. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (Ver2.0), ed. J.S. Wakeley, R.W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-10-3. Vicksburg, MSS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
Wetland Classification	USFWS / Cowardin Classification System	http://www.fws.gov/nwi/Pubs_Reports/Class_Manual/class_titlepg.htm https://www.fgdc.gov/standards/projects/wetlands/nvcs-2013	Cowardin, L. M., V. Carter, F. C. Golet, E. T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Federal Geographic Data Committee. 2013. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. FGDC-STD-004-2013. Second Edition. Wetlands Subcommittee, Federal Geographic Data Committee and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.
	Hydrogeomorphic Classification (HGM) System	http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/wetlands/pdfs/wrpde4.pdf	Brinson, M. M. (1993). "A hydrogeomorphic classification for wetlands," Technical Report WRP-DE-4, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
Wetland Rating	Washington State Wetland Rating System	https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1406029.pdf	Hruby. 2014. Washington State wetland rating system for western Washington: 2014 Update Publication # 14-06-029.
Wetland Indicator Status	2018 National Wetland Plant List	http://wetland-plants.usace.army.mil/nwpl_static/v34/home/home.html	Website.
Plant Names and Identification	USDA Plant Database	http://plants.usda.gov/	Website.
Soils Data	NRCS Soil Survey	http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/	Website.
	Field Indicators of Hydric Soils	https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_053171.pdf	NRCS. 2018. <i>Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 8.2.</i> L.M. Vasialas, G.W. Hurt, and C.V. Noble (eds.). USDA, NRCS, in cooperation with the National

Parameter	Method or Tool	Website	Reference
			Technical Committee for Hydric Soils.
Threatened and Endangered Species	Washington Natural Heritage Program	http://www.dnr.wa.gov/NHPlists.html	Washington Natural Heritage Program. Species Lists. Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Washington Natural Heritage Program, Olympia, WA
	Washington Priority Habitats and Species	http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phs/page.htm	Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) Program. Map of priority habitats and species in project vicinity. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW).
Species of Local Importance	WDFW GIS Data	http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/salmonscape/	Website
Report Preparation	DuPont Municipal Code	https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/DuPont/#!/DuPont25/DuPont25105.html#25.105.030	DuPont Municipal Code Chapter 25.105 (Critical Areas Ordinance)

Appendix B — Background Information

This appendix includes a USFWS Topographic Map, (B1); NRCS Soil Survey Map (B2); Pierce County Stream and Wetland Inventory Map (B3); USFWS NWI Map (B4); WDFW PHS Map (B5); DNR Stream Typing Map (B6); WDFW SalmonScape Map (B7); and FEMA Floodplain Map (B8).

Appendix B1 – USFWS Topographic Map




Appendix B2 – NRCS Soil Survey Map



3/9/2021, 5:52:25 AM


— Override 1
 — USA Soils Map Units

13D: Everett very gravelly sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes
 41A: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam




Pierce County WA, USDA FSA, GeoEye, Maxar, Source: USDA NRCS, Esri


Appendix B3 – Pierce County Stream and Wetland Inventory





Appendix B4 – USFWS NWI Map



Appendix B5 - WDFW PHS Map



3/9/2021, 6:09:14 AM



Pierce County WA, USDA FSA, GeoEye, Maxar, WDFW

Soundview Consultants

PHS Species/Habitats Overview:

Occurrence Name	Federal Status	State Status	Generalized Location
Waterfowl Concentrations	N/A	N/A	No
Freshwater Emergent Wetland	N/A	N/A	No
Big brown bat	N/A	N/A	Yes
Little Brown Bat	N/A	N/A	Yes
Yuma myotis	N/A	N/A	Yes

PHS Species/Habitats Details:

Waterfowl Concentrations	
Priority Area	Regular Concentration
Site Name	PIERCE COUNTY - NON-AGRICULTURAL
Accuracy	1/4 mile (Quarter Section)
Notes	LARGE REGULAR WATERFOWL CONCENTRATION AREAS, NON AGRICULTURAL IN PIERCE COUNTY.
Source Record	902562
Source Dataset	PHSREGION
Source Name	NAUER, DON
Source Entity	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Federal Status	N/A
State Status	N/A
PHS Listing Status	PHS Listed Occurrence
Sensitive	N
SGCN	N
Display Resolution	AS MAPPED
ManagementRecommendations	http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/pub.php?id=00026
Geometry Type	Polygons

Freshwater Emergent Wetland	
Priority Area	Aquatic Habitat
Site Name	N/A
Accuracy	NA
Notes	Wetland System: Freshwater Emergent Wetland - NWI Code: PEM1A
Source Dataset	NWIWetlands
Source Name	Not Given
Source Entity	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Federal Status	N/A
State Status	N/A
PHS Listing Status	PHS Listed Occurrence
Sensitive	N
SGCN	N
Display Resolution	AS MAPPED
ManagementRecommendations	http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/bas/index.html
Geometry Type	Polygons

Big brown bat	
Scientific Name	<i>Eptesicus fuscus</i>
Notes	This polygon mask represents one or more records of the above species or habitat occurrence. Contact PHS Data Release (360-902-2543) for obtaining information about masked sensitive species and habitats.
Federal Status	N/A
State Status	N/A
PHS Listing Status	PHS Listed Occurrence
Sensitive	Y
SGCN	N
Display Resolution	TOWNSHIP
ManagementRecommendations	http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/pub.php?id=00605

Little Brown Bat	
Scientific Name	<i>Myotis lucifugus</i>
Notes	This polygon mask represents one or more records of the above species or habitat occurrence. Contact PHS Data Release (360-902-2543) for obtaining information about masked sensitive species and habitats.
Federal Status	N/A
State Status	N/A
PHS Listing Status	PHS Listed Occurrence
Sensitive	Y
SGCN	N
Display Resolution	TOWNSHIP
ManagementRecommendations	http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/pub.php?id=00605

Yuma myotis	
Scientific Name	<i>Myotis yumanensis</i>
Notes	This polygon mask represents one or more records of the above species or habitat occurrence. Contact PHS Data Release (360-902-2543) for obtaining information about masked sensitive species and habitats.
Federal Status	N/A
State Status	N/A
PHS Listing Status	PHS Listed Occurrence
Sensitive	Y
SGCN	N
Display Resolution	TOWNSHIP
ManagementRecommendations	http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/pub.php?id=00605

DISCLAIMER. This report includes information that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) maintains in a central computer database. It is not an attempt to provide you with an official agency response as to the impacts of your project on fish and wildlife. This information only documents the location of fish and wildlife resources to the best of our knowledge. It is not a complete inventory and it is important to note that fish and wildlife resources may occur in areas not currently known to WDFW biologists, or in areas for which comprehensive surveys have not been conducted. Site specific surveys are frequently necessary to rule out the presence of priority resources. Locations of fish and wildlife resources are subject to variation caused by disturbance, changes in season and weather, and other factors. WDFW does not recommend using reports more than six months old.


Appendix B6 – DNR Stream Typing Map




Appendix B7 – WDFW SalmonScape Map



Appendix B8 – FEMA Floodplain Map





Appendix C — Existing Conditions and Proposed Plan Exhibits




PLAN LEGEND

- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- PROJECT LIMITS
- EXISTING WETLAND BOUNDARY
- EXISTING 75-FT WETLAND BUFFER



VICINITY MAP



SOURCE: PIERCE COUNTY GIS
(ACCESSED 5/24/2021)

APPLICANT/OWNER

NORTHPOINT DEVELOPMENT
4825 NW 41ST STREET, SUITE 500
RIVERSIDE, MO 64150
PHONE: (385) 351-9665

PIERCE COUNTY TAX PARCEL:

0119272005


ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT

SOUNDVIEW CONSULTANTS LLC
2907 HARBORVIEW DRIVE, SUITE D
GIG HARBOR, WA 98355
(253) 514-8952

SHEET INDEX

SHEET NUMBER	SHEET TITLE
1	EXISTING CONDITIONS
2	PROPOSED SITE PLAN & PROJECT LIMITS
3	VOLUNTARY BAT HABITAT RESTORATION PLAN & CONCEPTUAL PLANT SCHEDULE

Barghausen Consulting Engineers, Inc.
18215 72nd Avenue South
Kent, WA 98032
425.251.6222 barghausen.com



Soundview Consultants LLC
Environmental Assessment • Planning • Land Use Solutions
P. 253.514.8952
F. 253.514.8954
WWW.SOUNDVIEWCONSULTANTS.COM
2907 HARBORVIEW DRIVE, SUITE D
GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON 98335

FOUNDER'S RIDGE
XXXX CENTER DRIVE
DUPONT, WA 98327
SECTIONS 26 & 27, TOWNSHIP 19N,
RANGE 1E, W.M.


DATE: 5/26/2021

JOB: 1703.0007

BY: MW



SCALE: AS SHOWN

SHEET: 1




PLAN LEGEND

- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- CLEARING & GRADING LIMITS
- PROJECT LIMITS
- EXISTING WETLAND BOUNDARY
- EXISTING 75-FT WETLAND BUFFER



Barghausen Consulting Engineers, Inc.
18215 72nd Avenue South
Kent, WA 98032
425.251.6222 barghausen.com



Soundview Consultants LLC
Environmental Assessment • Planning • Land Use Solutions
P: 253.514.8952
F: 253.514.8954
2907 HARBORVIEW DRIVE, SUITE D
GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON 98335
WWW.SOUNDVIEWCONSULTANTS.COM

FOUNDER'S RIDGE
XXXX CENTER DRIVE
DUPONT, WA 98327
SECTIONS 26 & 27, TOWNSHIP 19N,
RANGE 1E, W.M.


DATE: 5/26/2021

JOB: 1703.0007


BY: MW

SCALE: AS SHOWN

SHEET: 2



BAT HABITAT RESTORATION PLAN



PLAN LEGEND

- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- CLEARING & GRADING LIMITS
- PROJECT LIMITS
- EXISTING WETLAND BOUNDARY
- EXISTING 75-FT WETLAND BUFFER


BAT HABITAT LEGEND

- FORESTED ENHANCMENT - DOUGLAS FIR (*PSEUDOTSUGA MENZIESII*) DOMINATED CANOPY 199,589 SF
 - 1. REMOVAL OF NON-NATIVE/INVASIVE SPECIES.
 - 2. THINNING OF EXISTING DOUGLAS FIR SAPLINGS TO 16-FT ON CENTER.
 - 3. PLANTING PITS TO BE AMENDED WITH COMPOST.
- FORESTED ENHANCMENT - QUAKING ASPEN (*POPULUS TREMULOIDES*) DOMINATED CANOPY 36,438 SF
 - 1. REMOVAL OF NON-NATIVE/INVASIVE SPECIES.
 - 2. THINNING OF EXISTING DOUGLAS FIR SAPLINGS TO 16-FT ON CENTER.
 - 3. ADD QUAKING ASPEN WITHIN 75-FT OF ROADWAY.
 - 4. PLANTING PITS TO BE AMENDED WITH COMPOST.
- RESTORATION OF TEMPORARY GRADING IMPACTS. 7,603 SF
 - 1. RESTORATION PLANTING AREAS MAY BE OVER-EXCAVATED WITH TOPSOIL AND COMPOST INSTALLED AT LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT DISCRETION.
- TOTAL MITIGATION AREA: 243,630 SF
- BAT HOUSE 7 EA


CONCEPTUAL PLANT SCHEDULE

		Area (sf):	199,589	36,438	7,603	243,630				
		Cov'g (%):	50	50	100					
		Trees (%):	5	25	25					
		Shrubs (%):	100	75	75					
Scientific Name	Common Name	WL Status	Douglas Fir Forest Enhancement	Quaking Aspen Forest Enhancement	Restoration Area	TOTAL	Spacing (min.)	Height (min.)	Size (min.)	Planting Area
TREES										
Betula papyrifera	Paperbark birch	FAC	-	-	22	22	10 ft	3 ft	2 gal	Dry/Moist - on hummock
Populus tremuloides	Quaking aspen	FACU	-	43	-	43	10 ft	3 ft	1 gal	Dry/Moist
Prunus emarginata	Bitter cherry	FACU	-	10	-	10	10 ft	3 ft	2 gal	Dry
		Total:	0	53	22	75				
SHRUBS										
Amelanchier alnifolia	Serviceberry	FACU	115	30	20	165	8 ft	3 ft	2 gal	Dry
Gaultheria shallon	Salal	FACU	2000	200	-	2200	4 - 5 ft	1 ft	1 gal	Dry
Holodiscus discolor	Oceanspray	FACU	300	100	-	400	5 ft	2 ft	1 gal	Dry
Lonicera involucrata	Black twinberry	FAC	200	-	-	200	4 ft	2 ft	1 gal	Moist/Wet
Ribes sanguineum	Red-flowering currant	FACU	100	-	40	140	5 ft	2 ft	1 gal	Dry/Moist
Rosa gymnocarpa	Bald hip rose	FACU	300	100	100	500	4 ft	2 ft	1 gal	Dry/Moist
Rosa nutkana	Nootka rose	FAC	400	-	-	400	4 ft	2 ft	1 gal	Dry
Rubus parviflorus	Thimbleberry	FACU	600	100	60	760	4 ft	2 ft	1 gal	Moist
Symphoricarpos albus	Snowberry	FACU	600	100	45	745	4 ft	2 ft	1 gal	Dry
		Total:	4615	630	265	5510				
Native Upland Grass Mix		20 lbs/acre								
		Total (lbs):	-	-	5	5				
1 - Scientific names and species identification taken from <i>Flora of the Pacific Northwest, 2nd Edition</i> (Hitchcock and Cronquist, Ed. by Giblin, Ledger, Zika, and Olmstead, 2018).										
2 - Over-sized container plants are suitable for replacement pending Project Biologist approval.										
3 - Native plant species may be substituted or added with Project Biologist approval.										
4 - All disturbed and bare soil areas in the voluntary bat habitat restoration area to be seeded with a native grass seed mix.										
5 - Tree calculations based upon 10-ft average spacing.										
6 - Shrub calculations based upon 5-ft average spacing.										
7 - Quantities are estimated and may be adjusted at time of construction.										


BAT HOUSE



TREE AND SHRUB PLANTING DETAIL (TYPICAL)



Barghausen Consulting Engineers, Inc.
18215 72nd Avenue South
Kent, WA 98032
425.251.6222
barghausen.com



Soundview Consultants LLC
Environmental Assessment • Planning • Land Use Solutions
P. 253.514.8952
F. 253.514.8954
WWW.SOUNDVIEWCONSULTANTS.COM
2907 HARBORVIEW DRIVE, SUITE D
GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON 98335

FOUNDER'S RIDGE
XXXX CENTER DRIVE
DUPONT, WA 98527
SECTIONS 26 & 27, TOWNSHIP 19N,
RANGE 1E, W.M.

DATE: 5/26/2021

JOB: 1703.0007

BY: MW

SCALE: AS SHOWN

SHEET: 3

Appendix D — Non-Wetland Data Forms

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-1
Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 1
Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.109235 Long: -122.66073409 Datum: WGS 84
Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the northern portion of the property.			

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>)				
1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>1</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>3</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>33%</u> (A/B)
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>5</u>	= Total Cover		Prevalence Index worksheet: Total % Cover of: _____ Multiply by: _____ OBL species _____ x 1 = _____ FACW species _____ x 2 = _____ FAC species _____ x 3 = _____ FACU species _____ x 4 = _____ UPL species _____ x 5 = _____ Column Totals: _____ (A) _____ (B) Prevalence Index = B/A = _____
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>)				
1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>UPL</u>	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>60</u>	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>10 ft</u>)				
1. <u>Poa annua</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FAC</u>	
2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
3. <u>Galium arpine</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
4. <u>Hypochaeris radicata</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
5. <u>Lapsana communis</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
6. _____	_____	_____	_____	
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	
10. _____	_____	_____	_____	
11. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>83</u>	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>)				
1. _____	_____	_____	_____	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>0</u>	= Total Cover		
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>17</u>				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain) ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
Remarks: <u>No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met.</u>				Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-1

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 16	10YR 3/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-2
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 1
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.107695 Long: 122.66076966 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the northern portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>1</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>5</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>20%</u> (A/B)
1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u> </u>	
2. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
3. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
4. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
<u>40</u> = Total Cover				
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>UPL</u>	Prevalence Index worksheet: Total % Cover of: <u> </u> Multiply by: OBL species <u> </u> x 1 = <u> </u> FACW species <u> </u> x 2 = <u> </u> FAC species <u> </u> x 3 = <u> </u> FACU species <u> </u> x 4 = <u> </u> UPL species <u> </u> x 5 = <u> </u> Column Totals: <u> </u> (A) <u> </u> (B) Prevalence Index = B/A = <u> </u>
2. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
3. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
4. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
5. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
<u>10</u> = Total Cover				
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)				
1. <u>Poa annua</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain) ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
3. <u>Agrostis capillaris</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FAC</u>	
4. <u>Hypochaeris radicata</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
5. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
6. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
7. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
8. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
9. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
10. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
11. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
<u>23</u> = Total Cover				
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒
2. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
<u>0</u> = Total Cover				
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>77</u>				
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. Moss and gravel present within the data plot.				

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-2

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 2	10YR 3/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaLo	Sandy loam
2 - 15	10YR 3/3	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-3
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Swale Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 2
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.108393 Long: -122.65944484 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the northern portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr><td>2. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Sapling/Shrub Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">UPL</td> </tr> <tr><td>2. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Herb Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>10 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Poa annua</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">60</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. <u>Hypochaeris radicata</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="text-align: center;">UPL</td> </tr> <tr><td>4. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>7. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">70</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <tbody> <tr><td>1. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>30</u>		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	15	Yes	FACU	2. _____				3. _____				4. _____					15	= Total Cover		1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	80	Yes	UPL	2. _____				3. _____				4. _____				5. _____					80	= Total Cover		1. <u>Poa annua</u>	60	Yes	FACU	2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	5	No	FACU	3. <u>Hypochaeris radicata</u>	5	No	UPL	4. _____				5. _____				6. _____				7. _____				8. _____				9. _____				10. _____				11. _____					70	= Total Cover		1. _____				2. _____					0	= Total Cover		Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>0</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>3</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>0%</u> (A/B) Prevalence Index worksheet: <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Total % Cover of:</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Multiply by:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OBL species _____</td> <td>x 1 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FACW species _____</td> <td>x 2 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FAC species _____</td> <td>x 3 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FACU species _____</td> <td>x 4 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UPL species _____</td> <td>x 5 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Column Totals: _____</td> <td>(A) _____ (B) _____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Prevalence Index = B/A = _____ Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain) ¹Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:	OBL species _____	x 1 = _____	FACW species _____	x 2 = _____	FAC species _____	x 3 = _____	FACU species _____	x 4 = _____	UPL species _____	x 5 = _____	Column Totals: _____	(A) _____ (B) _____
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																								
1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	15	Yes	FACU																																																																																																																								
2. _____																																																																																																																											
3. _____																																																																																																																											
4. _____																																																																																																																											
	15	= Total Cover																																																																																																																									
1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	80	Yes	UPL																																																																																																																								
2. _____																																																																																																																											
3. _____																																																																																																																											
4. _____																																																																																																																											
5. _____																																																																																																																											
	80	= Total Cover																																																																																																																									
1. <u>Poa annua</u>	60	Yes	FACU																																																																																																																								
2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	5	No	FACU																																																																																																																								
3. <u>Hypochaeris radicata</u>	5	No	UPL																																																																																																																								
4. _____																																																																																																																											
5. _____																																																																																																																											
6. _____																																																																																																																											
7. _____																																																																																																																											
8. _____																																																																																																																											
9. _____																																																																																																																											
10. _____																																																																																																																											
11. _____																																																																																																																											
	70	= Total Cover																																																																																																																									
1. _____																																																																																																																											
2. _____																																																																																																																											
	0	= Total Cover																																																																																																																									
Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:																																																																																																																										
OBL species _____	x 1 = _____																																																																																																																										
FACW species _____	x 2 = _____																																																																																																																										
FAC species _____	x 3 = _____																																																																																																																										
FACU species _____	x 4 = _____																																																																																																																										
UPL species _____	x 5 = _____																																																																																																																										
Column Totals: _____	(A) _____ (B) _____																																																																																																																										
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met.																																																																																																																											

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-3

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 14	10YR 2/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam
14 - 16	10YR 3/2	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-4
Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Depression Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 2
Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.107110 Long: -122.65884751 Datum: WGS 84
Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the north/central portion of the property.			

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Dominance Test worksheet:	
1.	<u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC:	<u>0</u> (A)
2.					Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata:	<u>3</u> (B)
3.					Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC:	<u>0%</u> (A/B)
4.						
		<u>10</u>	= Total Cover			
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Prevalence Index worksheet:	
1.	<u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>UPL</u>	Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:
2.	<u>Pseudotsuga menziesii (saplings)</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	OBL species	x 1 =
3.					FACW species	x 2 =
4.					FAC species	x 3 =
5.					FACU species	x 4 =
		<u>70</u>	= Total Cover		UPL species	x 5 =
					Column Totals:	(A) (B)
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Prevalence Index = B/A =	
1.	<u>Poa annua</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
2.	<u>Hypochaeris radicata</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)	
3.					¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.	
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
		<u>85</u>	= Total Cover			
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
1.						
2.						
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover			
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		<u>15</u>				
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. Approximately 10% moss and 90% bare ground present in the data plot.						

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-4

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 13	10YR 2/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam with cobbles
13 - 16	10YR 3/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-5
Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Plateau Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%): 0
Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.101675 Long: -122.65874345 Datum: WGS 84
Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected on the southern portion of the property.		

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.	<u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
		<u>65</u>	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.	<u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>UPL</u>
2.	<u>Pseudotsuga menziesii (saplings)</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
		<u>35</u>	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.	<u>Poa annua</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>
2.	<u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____	_____	_____
11.	_____	_____	_____	_____
		<u>35</u>	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		<u>65</u>		
Remarks: <u>No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met.</u>				

Dominance Test worksheet:

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

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

Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

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

Prevalence Index = B/A = _____

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation

☐ Dominance Test is >50%

☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹

☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)

☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹

☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-5

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 3	10YR 3/1	100	-	-	-	-	MeLo	Medium loam with gravel
3 - 15	10YR 3/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-6
Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%): 0
Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.102623 Long: -122.65761805 Datum: WGS 84
Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected on the west/central portion of the property.			

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)			Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.	<u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>		<u>70</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>
2.					
3.					
4.					
			<u>70</u>	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)					
1.	<u>Cytisus scoparius</u>		<u>5</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>UPL</u>
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
			<u>5</u>	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)					
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
			<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)					
1.					
2.					
			<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>100</u>					
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. Approximately 10% moss and 90% bare ground present in data plot.					

Dominance Test worksheet:

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

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 2 (B)

Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

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

Prevalence Index = B/A = _____

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☐ Dominance Test is >50%
- ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹
- ☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?

Yes ☐ No ☒

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-6

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 16	2.5Y 4/3	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-7
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Swale Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 1
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.103679 Long: -122.65692225 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected on the west/central portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>0</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>2</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>0%</u> (A/B)
1. _____	_____	Yes	_____	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	Prevalence Index worksheet: Total % Cover of: _____ Multiply by: OBL species _____ x 1 = _____ FACW species _____ x 2 = _____ FAC species _____ x 3 = _____ FACU species _____ x 4 = _____ UPL species _____ x 5 = _____ Column Totals: _____ (A) _____ (B) Prevalence Index = B/A = _____
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft) 1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u> <u>90</u> Yes <u>UPL</u>				
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain) ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft) 1. <u>Poa sp.*</u> <u>20</u> _____ <u>FAC</u>				
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
6. _____	_____	_____	_____	
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	
10. _____	_____	_____	_____	
11. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft) 1. _____				
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>80</u>				
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. Approximately 70% moss and 10% bare ground present in data plot. *Poa species considered facultative for scoring purposes.				

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-7

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 10	2.5Y 2.5/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam
10 - 16	10YR 3/2	100	-	-	-	-	GrSaLo	Gravelly sandy loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-8
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Swale Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 1
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.102285 Long: -122.65549397 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒		
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected on the central portion of the property.			

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.	<u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>
2.				
3.				
4.				
		<u>70</u>	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1.				
2.				
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum		<u>100</u>		
Remarks: <u>No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met.</u>				

Dominance Test worksheet:

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

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

Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

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

Prevalence Index = B/A = _____

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation

☐ Dominance Test is >50%

☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹

☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)

☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹

☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-8

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 15	10YR 4/3	100	-	-	-	-	Sand	Sand with gravel

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-9
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Swale Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 1
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.101355 Long: -122.65532446 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected on the south-central portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	
1. _____	_____	_____	_____	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>0</u>	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>UPL</u>	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>40</u>	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)				
1. <u>Poa sp.*</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FAC</u>	
2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
3. <u>Lapsana communis</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>FACU</u>	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
6. _____	_____	_____	_____	
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	
10. _____	_____	_____	_____	
11. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>45</u>	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1. _____	_____	_____	_____	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
	<u>0</u>	= Total Cover		
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>55</u>				
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. Approximately 50% moss present in the data plot. *Poa species considered facultative for scoring purposes.				

Dominance Test worksheet:
 Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)
 Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)
 Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 33% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:
OBL species _____	x 1 = _____
FACW species _____	x 2 = _____
FAC species _____	x 3 = _____
FACU species _____	x 4 = _____
UPL species _____	x 5 = _____
Column Totals: _____	(A) _____ (B) _____
Prevalence Index = B/A = _____	

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
☐ Dominance Test is >50%
☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹
☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹
☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain)
¹Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-9

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 11	10YR 2/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam
11 - 14+	10YR 3/3	100	-	-	-	-	GrSa	Gravelly sand

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-10
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 26 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Swale Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 1
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.101821 Long: -122.65379664 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ☐ No ☒	
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected on the central portion of the property.		

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status
1.	<u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>
2.				
3.				
4.				
		<u>70</u>	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				
1.				
2.				
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>100</u>				
Remarks: <u>No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met.</u>				

Dominance Test worksheet:

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

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

Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:
OBL species <u> </u>	x 1 = <u> </u>
FACW species <u> </u>	x 2 = <u> </u>
FAC species <u> </u>	x 3 = <u> </u>
FACU species <u> </u>	x 4 = <u> </u>
UPL species <u> </u>	x 5 = <u> </u>
Column Totals: <u> </u> (A)	<u> </u> (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A =

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☐ Dominance Test is >50%
- ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹
- ☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?

Yes ☐ No ☒

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-10

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 14+	10YR 5/3	100	-	-	-	-	GrSa	Gravelly sand

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-11
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 27 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%): 0
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.104589 Long: -122.65673222 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the west-central portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>1</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>2</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>50%</u> (A/B)
1. _____	_____	_____	_____	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	Prevalence Index worksheet: Total % Cover of: _____ Multiply by: OBL species _____ x 1 = _____ FACW species _____ x 2 = _____ FAC species _____ x 3 = _____ FACU species _____ x 4 = _____ UPL species _____ x 5 = _____ Column Totals: _____ (A) _____ (B) Prevalence Index = B/A = _____
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft) 1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u> <u>30</u> Yes <u>UPL</u>				
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain) ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft) 1. <u>Poa sp.*</u> <u>90</u> Yes <u>FAC</u>				
2. <u>Hypochaeris radicata</u> <u>2</u> No <u>FACU</u>	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
6. _____	_____	_____	_____	
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft) 1. _____ 2. _____
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	
10. _____	_____	_____	_____	
11. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒
12. _____	_____	_____	_____	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>8</u>				Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. *Poa species considered facultative for scoring purposes.
Remarks:				

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-11

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 16	10YR 2/1	100	-	-	-	-	GrLo	Gravelly loam
16+	10YR 3/1	100	-	-	-	-	GrLo	Gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-12
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 26 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%): 0
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.103815 Long: -122.65400610 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the central portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

Stratum	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Notes
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>)				
1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>1</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>2</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>50%</u> (A/B)
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
		<u>80</u>	= Total Cover	Prevalence Index worksheet: Total % Cover of: _____ Multiply by: OBL species _____ x 1 = _____ FACW species _____ x 2 = _____ FAC species _____ x 3 = _____ FACU species _____ x 4 = _____ UPL species _____ x 5 = _____ Column Totals: _____ (A) _____ (B) Prevalence Index = B/A = _____
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>)				
1. _____	_____	_____	_____	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain) ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>10 ft</u>)				
1. <u>Poa sp.*</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FAC</u>	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	
6. _____	_____	_____	_____	
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	
10. _____	_____	_____	_____	
11. _____	_____	_____	_____	
		<u>10</u>	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>)				
1. _____	_____	_____	_____	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	
		<u>0</u>	= Total Cover	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>90</u>				
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. *Poa species considered facultative for scoring purposes.				

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-12

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 8	10YR 3/1	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam
8 - 14+	10YR 5/3	100	-	-	-	-	GrSa	Gravelly sand

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-13
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 26 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%): 0
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.103560 Long: -122.65215529 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the eastern portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>10</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr><td>2. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>10</u></td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Sapling/Shrub Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>60</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">UPL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. <u>Rubus ursinus</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>10</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr><td>3. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>70</u></td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Herb Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>10 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Poa sp.*</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>45</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FAC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>15</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. <u>Galium aparine</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>10</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr><td>4. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>7. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>70</u></td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2. <u> </u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>0</u></td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>30</u>		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>10</u>	Yes	FACU	2. <u> </u>				3. <u> </u>				4. <u> </u>					<u>10</u>	= Total Cover			Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	<u>60</u>	Yes	UPL	2. <u>Rubus ursinus</u>	<u>10</u>	No	FACU	3. <u> </u>				4. <u> </u>				5. <u> </u>					<u>70</u>	= Total Cover			Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u>Poa sp.*</u>	<u>45</u>	Yes	FAC	2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	<u>15</u>	Yes	FACU	3. <u>Galium aparine</u>	<u>10</u>	No	FACU	4. <u> </u>				5. <u> </u>				6. <u> </u>				7. <u> </u>				8. <u> </u>				9. <u> </u>				10. <u> </u>				11. <u> </u>					<u>70</u>	= Total Cover			Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u> </u>				2. <u> </u>					<u>0</u>	= Total Cover		Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>1</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>4</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>25%</u> (A/B) Prevalence Index worksheet: <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Total % Cover of:</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Multiply by:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OBL species <u> </u></td> <td>x 1 = <u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FACW species <u> </u></td> <td>x 2 = <u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FAC species <u> </u></td> <td>x 3 = <u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FACU species <u> </u></td> <td>x 4 = <u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>UPL species <u> </u></td> <td>x 5 = <u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Column Totals: <u> </u> (A)</td> <td><u> </u> (B)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Prevalence Index = B/A = <u> </u> Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain) ¹Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:	OBL species <u> </u>	x 1 = <u> </u>	FACW species <u> </u>	x 2 = <u> </u>	FAC species <u> </u>	x 3 = <u> </u>	FACU species <u> </u>	x 4 = <u> </u>	UPL species <u> </u>	x 5 = <u> </u>	Column Totals: <u> </u> (A)	<u> </u> (B)
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																																				
1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>10</u>	Yes	FACU																																																																																																																																				
2. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
3. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
4. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
	<u>10</u>	= Total Cover																																																																																																																																					
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																																				
1. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	<u>60</u>	Yes	UPL																																																																																																																																				
2. <u>Rubus ursinus</u>	<u>10</u>	No	FACU																																																																																																																																				
3. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
4. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
5. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
	<u>70</u>	= Total Cover																																																																																																																																					
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																																				
1. <u>Poa sp.*</u>	<u>45</u>	Yes	FAC																																																																																																																																				
2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	<u>15</u>	Yes	FACU																																																																																																																																				
3. <u>Galium aparine</u>	<u>10</u>	No	FACU																																																																																																																																				
4. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
5. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
6. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
7. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
8. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
9. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
10. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
11. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
	<u>70</u>	= Total Cover																																																																																																																																					
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																																				
1. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
2. <u> </u>																																																																																																																																							
	<u>0</u>	= Total Cover																																																																																																																																					
Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:																																																																																																																																						
OBL species <u> </u>	x 1 = <u> </u>																																																																																																																																						
FACW species <u> </u>	x 2 = <u> </u>																																																																																																																																						
FAC species <u> </u>	x 3 = <u> </u>																																																																																																																																						
FACU species <u> </u>	x 4 = <u> </u>																																																																																																																																						
UPL species <u> </u>	x 5 = <u> </u>																																																																																																																																						
Column Totals: <u> </u> (A)	<u> </u> (B)																																																																																																																																						
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. *Poa species considered facultative for scoring purposes. Approximately 30% moss present in the data plot.																																																																																																																																							

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-13

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 16	10YR 3/2	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
 Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-14
 Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 26 / 19N / 1E
 Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%): 0
 Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.102294 Long: -122.65185579 Datum: WGS 84
 Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the eastern portion of the property.	

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">60</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr><td>2. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">60</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Sapling/Shrub Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Mahonia repens</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">30</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">UPL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">UPL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. <u>Rubus ursinus</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr><td>4. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">70</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Herb Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>10 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Absolute % Cover</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Dominant Species?</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Indicator Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. <u>Poa sp.*</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FAC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. <u>Polystichum munitum</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FACU</td> </tr> <tr><td>3. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>7. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= Total Cover</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30 ft</u>) <table style="width: 100%;"> <tbody> <tr><td>1. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2. _____</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>80</u> 0 = Total Cover		Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	60	Yes	FACU	2. _____				3. _____				4. _____					60	= Total Cover			Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u>Mahonia repens</u>	30	Yes	UPL	2. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	20	Yes	UPL	3. <u>Rubus ursinus</u>	20	Yes	FACU	4. _____				5. _____					70	= Total Cover			Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	1. <u>Poa sp.*</u>	15	Yes	FAC	2. <u>Polystichum munitum</u>	5	Yes	FACU	3. _____				4. _____				5. _____				6. _____				7. _____				8. _____				9. _____				10. _____				11. _____					20	= Total Cover		1. _____				2. _____				Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>1</u> (A) Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>6</u> (B) Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>17%</u> (A/B) Prevalence Index worksheet: <table style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Total % Cover of:</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Multiply by:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OBL species _____</td> <td>x 1 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FACW species _____</td> <td>x 2 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FAC species _____</td> <td>x 3 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FACU species _____</td> <td>x 4 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UPL species _____</td> <td>x 5 = _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Column Totals: _____</td> <td>(A) _____ (B) _____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Prevalence Index = B/A = _____ Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: ☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation ☐ Dominance Test is >50% ☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0¹ ☐ Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) ☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants¹ ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain) ¹Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:	OBL species _____	x 1 = _____	FACW species _____	x 2 = _____	FAC species _____	x 3 = _____	FACU species _____	x 4 = _____	UPL species _____	x 5 = _____	Column Totals: _____	(A) _____ (B) _____
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																												
1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	60	Yes	FACU																																																																																																																												
2. _____																																																																																																																															
3. _____																																																																																																																															
4. _____																																																																																																																															
	60	= Total Cover																																																																																																																													
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																												
1. <u>Mahonia repens</u>	30	Yes	UPL																																																																																																																												
2. <u>Cytisus scoparius</u>	20	Yes	UPL																																																																																																																												
3. <u>Rubus ursinus</u>	20	Yes	FACU																																																																																																																												
4. _____																																																																																																																															
5. _____																																																																																																																															
	70	= Total Cover																																																																																																																													
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status																																																																																																																												
1. <u>Poa sp.*</u>	15	Yes	FAC																																																																																																																												
2. <u>Polystichum munitum</u>	5	Yes	FACU																																																																																																																												
3. _____																																																																																																																															
4. _____																																																																																																																															
5. _____																																																																																																																															
6. _____																																																																																																																															
7. _____																																																																																																																															
8. _____																																																																																																																															
9. _____																																																																																																																															
10. _____																																																																																																																															
11. _____																																																																																																																															
	20	= Total Cover																																																																																																																													
1. _____																																																																																																																															
2. _____																																																																																																																															
Total % Cover of:	Multiply by:																																																																																																																														
OBL species _____	x 1 = _____																																																																																																																														
FACW species _____	x 2 = _____																																																																																																																														
FAC species _____	x 3 = _____																																																																																																																														
FACU species _____	x 4 = _____																																																																																																																														
UPL species _____	x 5 = _____																																																																																																																														
Column Totals: _____	(A) _____ (B) _____																																																																																																																														
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. *Poa species considered facultative for scoring purposes.																																																																																																																															

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-14

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 15	10YR 2/1	100	-	-	-	-	Loam	Loam with gravel
15+	10YR 2/2	100	-	-	-	-	SaGrLo	Sandy gravelly loam

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

Project/Site: 1703.0007 - Founders Ridge City/County: DuPont/Pierce Sampling Date: 03/10/2021
Applicant/Owner: NorthPoint Development State: WA Sampling Point: DP-15
Investigator(s): Ryan Krapp, Jake Layman Section, Township, Range: 26 / 19N / 1E
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Terrace Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%): 0
Subregion (LRR): A2 Lat: 47.102994 Long: -122.64973014 Datum: WGS 84
Soil Map Unit Name: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam NWI classification: N/A

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ☐ No ☒
Remarks: No wetland criteria met. Data collected in an upland area on the eastern portion of the property.	

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)				Dominance Test worksheet:	
	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status		
1. <u>Pseudotsuga menziesii</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>1</u> (A)	
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: <u>4</u> (B)	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>25%</u> (A/B)	
4. _____	<u>90</u>	= Total Cover			
<u>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)</u>				Prevalence Index worksheet:	
1. <u>Rubus ursinus</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Total % Cover of: _____ Multiply by: _____	
2. <u>Mahonia repens</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>UPL</u>	OBL species _____ x 1 = _____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	FACW species _____ x 2 = _____	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	FAC species _____ x 3 = _____	
5. _____	<u>40</u>	= Total Cover		FACU species _____ x 4 = _____	
<u>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 10 ft)</u>				UPL species _____ x 5 = _____	
1. <u>Poa sp.*</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FAC</u>	Column Totals: _____ (A) _____ (B)	
2. <u>Hypericum perforatum</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>FACU</u>	Prevalence Index = B/A = _____	
3. _____	_____	_____	_____	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
4. _____	_____	_____	_____	☐ Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
5. _____	_____	_____	_____	☐ Dominance Test is >50%	
6. _____	_____	_____	_____	☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹	
7. _____	_____	_____	_____	☐ Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)	
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	☐ Wetland Non-Vascular Plants ¹	
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)	
10. _____	<u>20</u>	= Total Cover		¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.	
11. _____	_____	_____	_____		
<u>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)</u>				Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒	
1. _____	_____	_____	_____		
2. _____	<u>0</u>	= Total Cover			
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum <u>80</u>					
Remarks: No hydrophytic vegetation criteria met. *Poa species considered facultative for scoring purposes. Approximately 75% moss present in the data plot.					

SOIL

Sampling Point: DP-15

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

Depth (inches)	Matrix		Redox Features			Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹			
0 - 14+	10YR 3/2	100	-	-	-	-	MeLo	Medium loam with gravel

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Histosol (A1) | ☐ Sandy Redox (S5) |
| ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2) | ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6) |
| ☐ Black Histic (A3) | ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (except MLRA 1) |
| ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) |
| ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3) |
| ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12) | ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6) |
| ☐ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7) |
| ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | ☐ Redox Depressions (F8) |

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils³:

- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Red Parent Material (TF2)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

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

Restrictive Layer (if present):

Type: None

Depth (inches): ---

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators met.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Surface Water (A1) | ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B) |
| ☐ High Water Table (A2) | ☐ Salt Crust (B11) |
| ☐ Saturation (A3) | ☐ Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) |
| ☐ Water Marks (B1) | ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) |
| ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2) | ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) |
| ☐ Drift Deposits (B3) | ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) |
| ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4) | ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) |
| ☐ Iron Deposits (B5) | ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A) |
| ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | |
| ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) | |

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (**MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B**)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- ☐ Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (**LRR A**)
- ☐ Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Water Table Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None

Saturation Present? Yes ☐ No ☒ Depth (inches): None
(includes capillary fringe)

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Remarks:

No wetland hydrology indicators observed.

Appendix E — Wetland Rating Form

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

RATING SUMMARY – Western Washington

Name of wetland (or ID #): A (Old Fort Lake) Date of site visit: 3/10/21

Rated by Jake Layman Trained by Ecology? ☒ Yes ☐ No Date of training _____

HGM Class used for rating Depressional Wetland has multiple HGM classes? ☐ Y ☒ N

NOTE: Form is not complete without the figures requested (figures can be combined).

Source of base aerial photo/map ESRI ArcGIS

OVERALL WETLAND CATEGORY III (based on functions ☒ or special characteristics ☐)

1. Category of wetland based on FUNCTIONS

_____ **Category I** – Total score = 23 - 27

_____ **Category II** – Total score = 20 - 22

☒ **Category III** – Total score = 16 - 19

_____ **Category IV** – Total score = 9 - 15

FUNCTION	Improving Water Quality	Hydrologic	Habitat	
Circle the appropriate ratings				
Site Potential	M	M	M	
Landscape Potential	M	M	L	
Value	M	L	M	TOTAL
Score Based on Ratings	6	5	5	16

**Score for each
function based
on three
ratings
(order of ratings
is not
important)**

9 = H,H,H

8 = H,H,M

7 = H,H,L

7 = H,M,M

6 = H,M,L

6 = M,M,M

5 = H,L,L

5 = M,M,L

4 = M,L,L

3 = L,L,L

2. Category based on SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS of wetland

CHARACTERISTIC	CATEGORY
Estuarine	I II
Wetland of High Conservation Value	I
Bog	I
Mature Forest	I
Old Growth Forest	I
Coastal Lagoon	I II
Interdunal	I II III IV
None of the above	N/A

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

Maps and figures required to answer questions correctly for Western Washington

Depressional Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	D 1.3, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Hydroperiods	D 1.4, H 1.2	
Location of outlet (<i>can be added to map of hydroperiods</i>)	D 1.1, D 4.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (<i>can be added to another figure</i>)	D 2.2, D 5.2	
Map of the contributing basin	D 4.3, D 5.3	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	D 3.1, D 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	D 3.3	

Riverine Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	H 1.1, H 1.4	
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	
Ponded depressions	R 1.1	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (<i>can be added to another figure</i>)	R 2.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	R 1.2, R 4.2	
Width of unit vs. width of stream (<i>can be added to another figure</i>)	R 4.1	
Map of the contributing basin	R 2.2, R 2.3, R 5.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	R 3.1	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	R 3.2, R 3.3	

Lake Fringe Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	L 1.1, L 4.1, H 1.1, H 1.4	
Plant cover of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	L 1.2	
Boundary of area within 150 ft of the wetland (<i>can be added to another figure</i>)	L 2.2	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	L 3.1, L 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	L 3.3	

Slope Wetlands

Map of:	To answer questions:	Figure #
Cowardin plant classes	H 1.1, H 1.4	
Hydroperiods	H 1.2	
Plant cover of dense trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants	S 1.3	
Plant cover of dense, rigid trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants (<i>can be added to figure above</i>)	S 4.1	
Boundary of 150 ft buffer (<i>can be added to another figure</i>)	S 2.1, S 5.1	
1 km Polygon: Area that extends 1 km from entire wetland edge - including polygons for accessible habitat and undisturbed habitat	H 2.1, H 2.2, H 2.3	
Screen capture of map of 303(d) listed waters in basin (from Ecology website)	S 3.1, S 3.2	
Screen capture of list of TMDLs for WRIA in which unit is found (from web)	S 3.3	

HGM Classification of Wetlands in Western Washington

For questions 1-7, the criteria described must apply to the entire unit being rated.

If the hydrologic criteria listed in each question do not apply to the entire unit being rated, you probably have a unit with multiple HGM classes. In this case, identify which hydrologic criteria in questions 1-7 apply, and go to Question 8.

1. Are the water levels in the entire unit usually controlled by tides except during floods?

☒ **NO** – go to 2 ☐ **YES** – the wetland class is **Tidal Fringe** – go to 1.1

1.1 Is the salinity of the water during periods of annual low flow below 0.5 ppt (parts per thousand)?

☐ **NO – Saltwater Tidal Fringe (Estuarine)** ☐ **YES – Freshwater Tidal Fringe**

*If your wetland can be classified as a Freshwater Tidal Fringe use the forms for **Riverine** wetlands. If it is Saltwater Tidal Fringe it is an **Estuarine** wetland and is not scored. This method **cannot** be used to score functions for estuarine wetlands.*

2. The entire wetland unit is flat and precipitation is the only source (>90%) of water to it. Groundwater and surface water runoff are NOT sources of water to the unit.

☒ **NO** – go to 3 ☐ **YES** – The wetland class is **Flats**

*If your wetland can be classified as a Flats wetland, use the form for **Depressional** wetlands.*

3. Does the entire wetland unit **meet all** of the following criteria?

☐ The vegetated part of the wetland is on the shores of a body of permanent open water (without any plants on the surface at any time of the year) at least 20 ac (8 ha) in size;

☐ At least 30% of the open water area is deeper than 6.6 ft (2 m).

☒ **NO** – go to 4 ☐ **YES** – The wetland class is **Lake Fringe** (Lacustrine Fringe)

4. Does the entire wetland unit **meet all** of the following criteria?

☐ The wetland is on a slope (*slope can be very gradual*),

☐ The water flows through the wetland in one direction (unidirectional) and usually comes from seeps. It may flow subsurface, as sheetflow, or in a swale without distinct banks,

☐ The water leaves the wetland **without being impounded**.

☒ **NO** – go to 5 ☐ **YES** – The wetland class is **Slope**

NOTE: Surface water does not pond in these type of wetlands except occasionally in very small and shallow depressions or behind hummocks (depressions are usually <3 ft diameter and less than 1 ft deep).

5. Does the entire wetland unit **meet all** of the following criteria?

☐ The unit is in a valley, or stream channel, where it gets inundated by overbank flooding from that stream or river,

☐ The overbank flooding occurs at least once every 2 years.

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

☒ NO – go to 6

☐ YES – The wetland class is **Riverine**

NOTE: The Riverine unit can contain depressions that are filled with water when the river is not flooding

6. Is the entire wetland unit in a topographic depression in which water ponds, or is saturated to the surface, at some time during the year? *This means that any outlet, if present, is higher than the interior of the wetland.*

☐ NO – go to 7

☒ YES – The wetland class is **Depressional**

7. Is the entire wetland unit located in a very flat area with no obvious depression and no overbank flooding? The unit does not pond surface water more than a few inches. The unit seems to be maintained by high groundwater in the area. The wetland may be ditched, but has no obvious natural outlet.

☐ NO – go to 8

☐ YES – The wetland class is **Depressional**

8. Your wetland unit seems to be difficult to classify and probably contains several different HGM classes. For example, seeps at the base of a slope may grade into a riverine floodplain, or a small stream within a Depressional wetland has a zone of flooding along its sides. **GO BACK AND IDENTIFY WHICH OF THE HYDROLOGIC REGIMES DESCRIBED IN QUESTIONS 1-7 APPLY TO DIFFERENT AREAS IN THE UNIT** (make a rough sketch to help you decide). Use the following table to identify the appropriate class to use for the rating system if you have several HGM classes present within the wetland unit being scored.

NOTE: Use this table only if the class that is recommended in the second column represents 10% or more of the total area of the wetland unit being rated. If the area of the HGM class listed in column 2 is less than 10% of the unit; classify the wetland using the class that represents more than 90% of the total area.

HGM classes within the wetland unit being rated	HGM class to use in rating
Slope + Riverine	Riverine
Slope + Depressional	Depressional
Slope + Lake Fringe	Lake Fringe
Depressional + Riverine along stream within boundary of depression	Depressional
Depressional + Lake Fringe	Depressional
Riverine + Lake Fringe	Riverine
Salt Water Tidal Fringe and any other class of freshwater wetland	Treat as ESTUARINE

*If you are still unable to determine which of the above criteria apply to your wetland, or if you have **more than 2 HGM classes** within a wetland boundary, classify the wetland as Depressional for the rating.*

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

DEPRESSIONAL AND FLATS WETLANDS	
Water Quality Functions - Indicators that the site functions to improve water quality	
D 1.0. Does the site have the potential to improve water quality?	
D 1.1. Characteristics of surface water outflows from the wetland: Wetland is a depression or flat depression (QUESTION 7 on key) with no surface water leaving it (no outlet). points = 3 Wetland has an intermittently flowing stream or ditch, OR highly constricted permanently flowing outlet. points = 2 Wetland has an unconstricted, or slightly constricted, surface outlet that is permanently flowing points = 1 Wetland is a flat depression (QUESTION 7 on key), whose outlet is a permanently flowing ditch. points = 1	3
D 1.2. The soil 2 in below the surface (or duff layer) is true clay or true organic (use NRCS definitions). Yes = 4 No = 0	0
D 1.3. Characteristics and distribution of persistent plants (Emergent, Scrub-shrub, and/or Forested Cowardin classes): Wetland has persistent, ungrazed, plants > 95% of area points = 5 Wetland has persistent, ungrazed, plants > ½ of area points = 3 Wetland has persistent, ungrazed plants > 1/10 of area points = 1 Wetland has persistent, ungrazed plants < 1/10 of area points = 0	3
D 1.4. Characteristics of seasonal ponding or inundation: <i>This is the area that is ponded for at least 2 months. See description in manual.</i> Area seasonally ponded is > ½ total area of wetland points = 4 Area seasonally ponded is > ¼ total area of wetland points = 2 Area seasonally ponded is < ¼ total area of wetland points = 0	0
Total for D 1	6

Rating of Site Potential If score is: 12-16 = H X 6-11 = M 0-5 = L Record the rating on the first page

D 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the water quality function of the site?	
D 2.1. Does the wetland unit receive stormwater discharges?	Yes = 1 No = 0
D 2.2. Is > 10% of the area within 150 ft of the wetland in land uses that generate pollutants?	Yes = 1 No = 0
D 2.3. Are there septic systems within 250 ft of the wetland?	Yes = 1 No = 0
D 2.4. Are there other sources of pollutants coming into the wetland that are not listed in questions D 2.1-D 2.3?	Yes = 1 No = 0
Source <u>Golf course nearby</u>	
Total for D 2	1

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 3 or 4 = H X 1 or 2 = M 0 = L Record the rating on the first page

D 3.0. Is the water quality improvement provided by the site valuable to society?	
D 3.1. Does the wetland discharge directly (i.e., within 1 mi) to a stream, river, lake, or marine water that is on the 303(d) list?	Yes = 1 No = 0
D 3.2. Is the wetland in a basin or sub-basin where an aquatic resource is on the 303(d) list?	Yes = 1 No = 0
D 3.3. Has the site been identified in a watershed or local plan as important for maintaining water quality (answer YES if there is a TMDL for the basin in which the unit is found)?	Yes = 2 No = 0
Total for D 3	1

Rating of Value If score is: 2-4 = H X 1 = M 0 = L Record the rating on the first page

NOTES and FIELD OBSERVATIONS:

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

DEPRESSIONAL AND FLATS WETLANDS

Hydrologic Functions - Indicators that the site functions to reduce flooding and stream degradation

D 4.0. Does the site have the potential to reduce flooding and erosion?

D 4.1. Characteristics of surface water outflows from the wetland:

Wetland is a depression or flat depression with no surface water leaving it (no outlet) points = 4

Wetland has an intermittently flowing stream or ditch, OR highly constricted permanently flowing outlet points = 2

Wetland is a flat depression (QUESTION 7 on key), whose outlet is a permanently flowing ditch points = 1

Wetland has an unconstricted, or slightly constricted, surface outlet that is permanently flowing points = 0

4

D 4.2. Depth of storage during wet periods: Estimate the height of ponding above the bottom of the outlet. For wetlands with no outlet, measure from the surface of permanent water or if dry, the deepest part.

Marks of ponding are 3 ft or more above the surface or bottom of outlet points = 7

Marks of ponding between 2 ft to < 3 ft from surface or bottom of outlet points = 5

Marks are at least 0.5 ft to < 2 ft from surface or bottom of outlet points = 3

The wetland is a "headwater" wetland points = 3

Wetland is flat but has small depressions on the surface that trap water points = 1

Marks of ponding less than 0.5 ft (6 in) points = 0

3

D 4.3. Contribution of the wetland to storage in the watershed: Estimate the ratio of the area of upstream basin contributing surface water to the wetland to the area of the wetland unit itself.

The area of the basin is less than 10 times the area of the unit points = 5

The area of the basin is 10 to 100 times the area of the unit points = 3

The area of the basin is more than 100 times the area of the unit points = 0

Entire wetland is in the Flats class points = 5

3

Total for D 4

Add the points in the boxes above

10

Rating of Site Potential If score is: 12-16 = H X 6-11 = M 0-5 = L

Record the rating on the first page

D 5.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support hydrologic functions of the site?

D 5.1. Does the wetland receive stormwater discharges? Yes = 1 No = 0

0

D 5.2. Is >10% of the area within 150 ft of the wetland in land uses that generate excess runoff? Yes = 1 No = 0

0

D 5.3. Is more than 25% of the contributing basin of the wetland covered with intensive human land uses (residential at >1 residence/ac, urban, commercial, agriculture, etc.)? Yes = 1 No = 0

1

Total for D 5

Add the points in the boxes above

1

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 3 = H X 1 or 2 = M 0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

D 6.0. Are the hydrologic functions provided by the site valuable to society?

D 6.1. The unit is in a landscape that has flooding problems. Choose the description that best matches conditions around the wetland unit being rated. Do not add points. Choose the highest score if more than one condition is met.

The wetland captures surface water that would otherwise flow down-gradient into areas where flooding has damaged human or natural resources (e.g., houses or salmon redds):

• Flooding occurs in a sub-basin that is immediately down-gradient of unit. points = 2

• Surface flooding problems are in a sub-basin farther down-gradient. points = 1

Flooding from groundwater is an issue in the sub-basin. points = 1

The existing or potential outflow from the wetland is so constrained by human or natural conditions that the water stored by the wetland cannot reach areas that flood. Explain why _____ points = 0

There are no problems with flooding downstream of the wetland. points = 0

0

D 6.2. Has the site been identified as important for flood storage or flood conveyance in a regional flood control plan?

Yes = 2 No = 0

0

Total for D 6

Add the points in the boxes above

0

Rating of Value If score is: 2-4 = H 1 = M X 0 = L

Record the rating on the first page

These questions apply to wetlands of all HGM classes.

HABITAT FUNCTIONS - Indicators that site functions to provide important habitat

H 1.0. Does the site have the potential to provide habitat?

H 1.1. Structure of plant community: *Indicators are Cowardin classes and strata within the Forested class. Check the Cowardin plant classes in the wetland. Up to 10 patches may be combined for each class to meet the threshold of ¼ ac or more than 10% of the unit if it is smaller than 2.5 ac. Add the number of structures checked.*

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| ☒ Aquatic bed | 4 structures or more: points = 4 |
| ☒ Emergent | 3 structures: points = 2 |
| ☐ Scrub-shrub (areas where shrubs have > 30% cover) | 2 structures: points = 1 |
| ☐ Forested (areas where trees have > 30% cover) | 1 structure: points = 0 |
- If the unit has a Forested class, check if:*
- ☐ The Forested class has 3 out of 5 strata (canopy, sub-canopy, shrubs, herbaceous, moss/ground-cover) that each cover 20% within the Forested polygon

1

H 1.2. Hydroperiods

Check the types of water regimes (hydroperiods) present within the wetland. The water regime has to cover more than 10% of the wetland or ¼ ac to count (*see text for descriptions of hydroperiods*).

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| ☒ Permanently flooded or inundated | 4 or more types present: points = 3 |
| ☒ Seasonally flooded or inundated | 3 types present: points = 2 |
| ☐ Occasionally flooded or inundated | 2 types present: points = 1 |
| ☒ Saturated only | 1 type present: points = 0 |
- ☐ Permanently flowing stream or river in, or adjacent to, the wetland
- ☐ Seasonally flowing stream in, or adjacent to, the wetland
- ☐ **Lake Fringe wetland** **2 points**
- ☐ **Freshwater tidal wetland** **2 points**

2

H 1.3. Richness of plant species

Count the number of plant species in the wetland that cover at least 10 ft².


*Different patches of the same species can be combined to meet the size threshold and you do not have to name the species. **Do not include Eurasian milfoil, reed canarygrass, purple loosestrife, Canadian thistle***

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| If you counted: > 19 species | points = 2 |
| 5 - 19 species | points = 1 |
| < 5 species | points = 0 |


1

H 1.4. Interspersion of habitats


Decide from the diagrams below whether interspersions among Cowardin plants classes (described in H 1.1), or the classes and unvegetated areas (can include open water or mudflats) is high, moderate, low, or none. *If you have four or more plant classes or three classes and open water, the rating is always high.*




None = 0 points



Low = 1 point






Moderate = 2 points



3

All three diagrams in this row are **HIGH** = 3points



Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

H 1.5. Special habitat features: Check the habitat features that are present in the wetland. <i>The number of checks is the number of points.</i> ☒ Large, downed, woody debris within the wetland (> 4 in diameter and 6 ft long). ☐ Standing snags (dbh > 4 in) within the wetland ☐ Undercut banks are present for at least 6.6 ft (2 m) and/or overhanging plants extends at least 3.3 ft (1 m) over a stream (or ditch) in, or contiguous with the wetland, for at least 33 ft (10 m) ☐ Stable steep banks of fine material that might be used by beaver or muskrat for denning (> 30 degree slope) OR signs of recent beaver activity are present (<i>cut shrubs or trees that have not yet weathered where wood is exposed</i>) ☒ At least ¼ ac of thin-stemmed persistent plants or woody branches are present in areas that are permanently or seasonally inundated (<i>structures for egg-laying by amphibians</i>) ☒ Invasive plants cover less than 25% of the wetland area in every stratum of plants (<i>see H 1.1 for list of strata</i>)		3
Total for H 1	Add the points in the boxes above	10

Rating of Site Potential If score is: 15-18 = H X 7-14 = M 0-6 = L
Record the rating on the first page

H 2.0. Does the landscape have the potential to support the habitat functions of the site?		
H 2.1. Accessible habitat (include <i>only habitat that directly abuts wetland unit</i>). Calculate: <u>0.00</u> % undisturbed habitat + [(% moderate and low intensity land uses) <u>2.54</u> /2] = <u>1.27</u> % If total accessible habitat is: > 1/3 (33.3%) of 1 km Polygon points = 3 20-33% of 1 km Polygon points = 2 10-19% of 1 km Polygon points = 1 < 10% of 1 km Polygon points = 0		0
H 2.2. Undisturbed habitat in 1 km Polygon around the wetland. Calculate: <u>11.86</u> % undisturbed habitat + [(% moderate and low intensity land uses) <u>16.80</u> /2] = <u>20.259999999999999</u> % Undisturbed habitat > 50% of Polygon points = 3 Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and in 1-3 patches points = 2 Undisturbed habitat 10-50% and > 3 patches points = 1 Undisturbed habitat < 10% of 1 km Polygon points = 0		0
H 2.3. Land use intensity in 1 km Polygon: If > 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity land use points = (- 2) ≤ 50% of 1 km Polygon is high intensity points = 0		-2
Total for H 2	Add the points in the boxes above	-2

Rating of Landscape Potential If score is: 4-6 = H 1-3 = M X < 1 = L
Record the rating on the first page

H 3.0. Is the habitat provided by the site valuable to society?		
H 3.1. Does the site provide habitat for species valued in laws, regulations, or policies? <i>Choose only the highest score that applies to the wetland being rated.</i> Site meets ANY of the following criteria: points = 2 — It has 3 or more priority habitats within 100 m (see next page) — It provides habitat for Threatened or Endangered species (any plant or animal on the state or federal lists) — It is mapped as a location for an individual WDFW priority species — It is a Wetland of High Conservation Value as determined by the Department of Natural Resources — It has been categorized as an important habitat site in a local or regional comprehensive plan, in a Shoreline Master Plan, or in a watershed plan ☒ Site has 1 or 2 priority habitats (listed on next page) within 100 m points = 1 Site does not meet any of the criteria above points = 0		1

Rating of Value If score is: 2 = H X 1 = M 0 = L
Record the rating on the first page

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

WDFW Priority Habitats

Priority habitats listed by WDFW (see complete descriptions of WDFW priority habitats, and the counties in which they can be found, in: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2008. Priority Habitat and Species List. Olympia, Washington. 177 pp. <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00165/wdfw00165.pdf> or access the list from here: <http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/list/>)

Count how many of the following priority habitats are within 330 ft (100 m) of the wetland unit: **NOTE:** *This question is independent of the land use between the wetland unit and the priority habitat.*

- **Aspen Stands:** Pure or mixed stands of aspen greater than 1 ac (0.4 ha).
- **Biodiversity Areas and Corridors:** Areas of habitat that are relatively important to various species of native fish and wildlife (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report*).
- **Herbaceous Balds:** Variable size patches of grass and forbs on shallow soils over bedrock.
- **Old-growth/Mature forests:** Old-growth west of Cascade crest – Stands of at least 2 tree species, forming a multi-layered canopy with occasional small openings; with at least 8 trees/ac (20 trees/ha) > 32 in (81 cm) dbh or > 200 years of age. Mature forests – Stands with average diameters exceeding 21 in (53 cm) dbh; crown cover may be less than 100%; decay, decadence, numbers of snags, and quantity of large downed material is generally less than that found in old-growth; 80-200 years old west of the Cascade crest.
- **Oregon White Oak:** Woodland stands of pure oak or oak/conifer associations where canopy coverage of the oak component is important (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 158 – see web link above*).
- ✗ **Riparian:** The area adjacent to aquatic systems with flowing water that contains elements of both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems which mutually influence each other.
- **Westside Prairies:** Herbaceous, non-forested plant communities that can either take the form of a dry prairie or a wet prairie (*full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 161 – see web link above*).
- **Instream:** The combination of physical, biological, and chemical processes and conditions that interact to provide functional life history requirements for instream fish and wildlife resources.
- **Nearshore:** Relatively undisturbed nearshore habitats. These include Coastal Nearshore, Open Coast Nearshore, and Puget Sound Nearshore. (*full descriptions of habitats and the definition of relatively undisturbed are in WDFW report – see web link on previous page*).
- **Caves:** A naturally occurring cavity, recess, void, or system of interconnected passages under the earth in soils, rock, ice, or other geological formations and is large enough to contain a human.
- **Cliffs:** Greater than 25 ft (7.6 m) high and occurring below 5000 ft elevation.
- **Talus:** Homogenous areas of rock rubble ranging in average size 0.5 - 6.5 ft (0.15 - 2.0 m), composed of basalt, andesite, and/or sedimentary rock, including riprap slides and mine tailings. May be associated with cliffs.
- ✗ **Snags and Logs:** Trees are considered snags if they are dead or dying and exhibit sufficient decay characteristics to enable cavity excavation/use by wildlife. Priority snags have a diameter at breast height of > 20 in (51 cm) in western Washington and are > 6.5 ft (2 m) in height. Priority logs are > 12 in (30 cm) in diameter at the largest end, and > 20 ft (6 m) long.

Note: All vegetated wetlands are by definition a priority habitat but are not included in this list because they are addressed elsewhere.

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

CATEGORIZATION BASED ON SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Wetland Type	Category
<i>Check off any criteria that apply to the wetland. Circle the category when the appropriate criteria are met.</i>	
SC 1.0. Estuarine wetlands Does the wetland meet the following criteria for Estuarine wetlands? ☐ The dominant water regime is tidal, ☐ Vegetated, and ☐ With a salinity greater than 0.5 ppt ☐ Yes –Go to SC 1.1 ☒ No = Not an estuarine wetland	
SC 1.1. Is the wetland within a National Wildlife Refuge, National Park, National Estuary Reserve, Natural Area Preserve, State Park or Educational, Environmental, or Scientific Reserve designated under WAC 332-30-151? ☐ Yes = Category I ☐ No - Go to SC 1.2	
SC 1.2. Is the wetland unit at least 1 ac in size and meets at least two of the following three conditions? ☐ The wetland is relatively undisturbed (has no diking, ditching, filling, cultivation, grazing, and has less than 10% cover of non-native plant species. (If non-native species are <i>Spartina</i> , see page 25) ☐ At least ¾ of the landward edge of the wetland has a 100 ft buffer of shrub, forest, or un-grazed or unmowed grassland. ☐ The wetland has at least two of the following features: tidal channels, depressions with open water, or contiguous freshwater wetlands. ☐ Yes = Category I ☐ No = Category II	
SC 2.0. Wetlands of High Conservation Value (WHCV) SC 2.1. Has the WA Department of Natural Resources updated their website to include the list of Wetlands of High Conservation Value? ☐ Yes – Go to SC 2.2 ☒ No – Go to SC 2.3 SC 2.2. Is the wetland listed on the WDNR database as a Wetland of High Conservation Value? ☐ Yes = Category I ☒ No = Not a WHCV SC 2.3. Is the wetland in a Section/Township/Range that contains a Natural Heritage wetland? http://www1.dnr.wa.gov/nhp/refdesk/datasearch/wnhpwetlands.pdf ☐ Yes – Contact WNHP/WDNR and go to SC 2.4 ☒ No = Not a WHCV SC 2.4. Has WDNR identified the wetland within the S/T/R as a Wetland of High Conservation Value and listed it on their website? ☐ Yes = Category I ☒ No = Not a WHCV	
SC 3.0. Bogs Does the wetland (or any part of the unit) meet both the criteria for soils and vegetation in bogs? <i>Use the key below. If you answer YES you will still need to rate the wetland based on its functions.</i> SC 3.1. Does an area within the wetland unit have organic soil horizons, either peats or mucks, that compose 16 in or more of the first 32 in of the soil profile? ☐ Yes – Go to SC 3.3 ☒ No – Go to SC 3.2 SC 3.2. Does an area within the wetland unit have organic soils, either peats or mucks, that are less than 16 in deep over bedrock, or an impermeable hardpan such as clay or volcanic ash, or that are floating on top of a lake or pond? ☐ Yes – Go to SC 3.3 ☒ No = Is not a bog SC 3.3. Does an area with peats or mucks have more than 70% cover of mosses at ground level, AND at least a 30% cover of plant species listed in Table 4? ☐ Yes = Is a Category I bog ☐ No – Go to SC 3.4 NOTE: If you are uncertain about the extent of mosses in the understory, you may substitute that criterion by measuring the pH of the water that seeps into a hole dug at least 16 in deep. If the pH is less than 5.0 and the plant species in Table 4 are present, the wetland is a bog. SC 3.4. Is an area with peats or mucks forested (> 30% cover) with Sitka spruce, subalpine fir, western red cedar, western hemlock, lodgepole pine, quaking aspen, Engelmann spruce, or western white pine, AND any of the species (or combination of species) listed in Table 4 provide more than 30% of the cover under the canopy? ☐ Yes = Is a Category I bog ☐ No = Is not a bog	

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)


SC 4.0. Forested Wetlands Does the wetland have at least <u>1 contiguous acre</u> of forest that meets one of these criteria for the WA Department of Fish and Wildlife's forests as priority habitats? <i>If you answer YES you will still need to rate the wetland based on its functions.</i> — Old-growth forests (west of Cascade crest): Stands of at least two tree species, forming a multi-layered canopy with occasional small openings; with at least 8 trees/ac (20 trees/ha) that are at least 200 years of age OR have a diameter at breast height (dbh) of 32 in (81 cm) or more. — Mature forests (west of the Cascade Crest): Stands where the largest trees are 80- 200 years old OR the species that make up the canopy have an average diameter (dbh) exceeding 21 in (53 cm). ☐ Yes = Category I ☒ No = Not a forested wetland for this section	
SC 5.0. Wetlands in Coastal Lagoons Does the wetland meet all of the following criteria of a wetland in a coastal lagoon? — The wetland lies in a depression adjacent to marine waters that is wholly or partially separated from marine waters by sandbanks, gravel banks, shingle, or, less frequently, rocks — The lagoon in which the wetland is located contains ponded water that is saline or brackish (> 0.5 ppt) during most of the year in at least a portion of the lagoon (<i>needs to be measured near the bottom</i>) ☐ Yes – Go to SC 5.1 ☒ No = Not a wetland in a coastal lagoon SC 5.1. Does the wetland meet all of the following three conditions? — The wetland is relatively undisturbed (has no diking, ditching, filling, cultivation, grazing), and has less than 20% cover of aggressive, opportunistic plant species (see list of species on p. 100). — At least ¾ of the landward edge of the wetland has a 100 ft buffer of shrub, forest, or un-grazed or unmowed grassland. — The wetland is larger than $\frac{1}{10}$ ac (4350 ft²) ☐ Yes = Category I ☐ No = Category II	
SC 6.0. Interdunal Wetlands Is the wetland west of the 1889 line (also called the Western Boundary of Upland Ownership or WBUO)? <i>If you answer yes you will still need to rate the wetland based on its habitat functions.</i> In practical terms that means the following geographic areas: — Long Beach Peninsula: Lands west of SR 103 — Grayland-Westport: Lands west of SR 105 — Ocean Shores-Copalis: Lands west of SR 115 and SR 109 ☐ Yes – Go to SC 6.1 ☒ No = not an interdunal wetland for rating SC 6.1. Is the wetland 1 ac or larger and scores an 8 or 9 for the habitat functions on the form (rates H,H,H or H,H,M for the three aspects of function)? ☐ Yes = Category I ☐ No – Go to SC 6.2 SC 6.2. Is the wetland 1 ac or larger, or is it in a mosaic of wetlands that is 1 ac or larger? ☐ Yes = Category II ☐ No – Go to SC 6.3 SC 6.3. Is the unit between 0.1 and 1 ac, or is it in a mosaic of wetlands that is between 0.1 and 1 ac? ☐ Yes = Category III ☐ No = Category IV	
Category of wetland based on Special Characteristics If you answered No for all types, enter "Not Applicable" on Summary Form	

Wetland name or number A (Old Fort Lake)

This page left blank intentionally

Appendix F — Wetland Rating Maps

FOUNDER'S RIDGE - COWARDIN MAP





Soundview Consultants LLC
Environmental Assessment • Planning • Land Use Solutions
2907 Harborview Dr., Suite D, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
Phone: (253) 514-8952 Fax: (253) 514-8954
www.soundviewconsultants.com

FOUNDER'S RIDGE
XXXX CENTER DRIVE
DUPONT, WA 98327
PIERCE COUNTY PARCEL NUMBER:
0119272005

DATE: 3/17/2021
JOB: 1703.0007
BY: DLS
SCALE: 1" = 280'
FIGURE NO. 1 of 5

FOUNDER'S RIDGE - HYDROPERIOD MAP



Soundview Consultants LLC
Environmental Assessment • Planning • Land Use Solutions
2907 Harborview Dr., Suite D, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
Phone: (253) 514-8952 Fax: (253) 514-8954
www.soundviewconsultants.com

FOUNDER'S RIDGE

XXXX CENTER DRIVE
DUPONT, WA 98327

PIERCE COUNTY PARCEL NUMBER:
0119272005

DATE: 3/17/2021


JOB: 1703.0007

BY: DLS

SCALE: 1" = 280'

FIGURE NO. 2 of 5

FOUNDER'S RIDGE - CONTRIBUTING BASIN MAP



D.4.0

D.4.3

	Area of Contributing Basin (SF)	20,821,067
	Area of Wetland A (SF)	854,908
	Percent of Wetland A within Contributing Basin	4.106%

D.5.0

D.5.3

	Is the Percentage of Intensive Human Land Use within Contributing Basin Greater than 25%	Yes
--	---	------------



Soundview Consultants LLC
Environmental Assessment • Planning • Land Use Solutions
2907 Harborview Dr., Suite D, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
Phone: (253) 514-8952 Fax: (253) 514-8954
www.soundviewconsultants.com

FOUNDER'S RIDGE

XXXX CENTER DRIVE
DUPONT, WA 98327

PIERCE COUNTY PARCEL NUMBER:
0119272005

DATE: 3/17/2021


JOB: 1703.0007

BY: DLS

SCALE: 1" = 1,000'

FIGURE NO. 3 of 5

FOUNDER'S RIDGE - HABITAT MAP



H.2.0 Wetland A		
H.2.1		
	Abutting Undisturbed Habitat	0.00%
	Abutting Moderate & Low Intensity Land Uses	2.54%
	Accessible Habitat	1.27%
H.2.2		
	Undisturbed Habitat	11.86%
	Moderate & Low Intensity Land Uses	16.80%
	Undisturbed Habitat in 1 KM Polygon	20.26%
H.2.3		
	High Intensity Land Use in 1 KM Polygon	71.34%



Soundview Consultants LLC
 Environmental Assessment • Planning • Land Use Solutions
 2907 Harborview Dr., Suite D, Gig Harbor, WA 98335
 Phone: (253) 514-8952 Fax: (253) 514-8954
www.soundviewconsultants.com

FOUNDER'S RIDGE

XXXX CENTER DRIVE
 DUPONT, WA 98327

PIERCE COUNTY PARCEL NUMBER:
 0119272005

DATE: 3/17/2021

JOB: 1703.0007

BY: DLS

SCALE: 1" = 1,500'

FIGURE NO. 4 of 5

Appendix G— Qualifications

All field inspections, jurisdictional wetland boundary delineations, OHW determinations, habitat assessments, and supporting documentation, including this *Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Report and Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan* prepared for *Founder's Ridge*, were prepared by, or under the direction of Matt DeCaro of SVC. In addition, site investigations were performed by Racheal Hyland, Ryan Krapp and Jake Layman, and report preparation was completed by Kelly Kramer, Racheal Hyland, and Laura Livingston.

Matt DeCaro

Associate Principal

Professional Experience: 12 years

Matt DeCaro is an Associate Principal and Senior Scientist with a diverse background in environmental planning, wetland science, stream ecology, water quality, site remediation, NEPA compliance, and project management. He manages a wide range of industrial, commercial, and multi-family residential projects throughout Western Washington, providing environmental permitting and regulatory compliance assistance for land use projects from their planning stages through entitlement and construction. His local expertise, diverse professional background, and positive relationships with regulatory personnel are integral components of his successful project outcomes.

Matt earned a Bachelor of Science degree with a focus in Environmental Science from the Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington, with additional graduate-level coursework and research in aquatic restoration and salmonid ecology. Matt has received 40-hour wetland delineation training (*Western Mountains, Valleys, & Coast and Arid West Regional Supplements*) and regularly performs wetland, stream, and shoreline delineations. Matt has been formally trained in the use of the *2014 Washington State Wetland Rating System* and *Determination of Ordinary High Water Mark* by WSDOE, and he is a Pierce County Qualified Wetland Specialist and Wildlife Biologist. He has attended USFWS survey workshops for multiple threatened and endangered species, and he is a Senior Author of WSDOT Biological Assessments. Matt holds 40-hour HAZWOPER training and has managed Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, subsurface investigations, and contaminant remediation projects throughout the Pacific Northwest. His diverse experience also includes NEPA compliance for federal permitting projects; noxious weed abatement; army ant research in the Costa Rican tropical rainforest; spotted owl surveys on federal and private lands; and salmonid spawning and migration surveys.

Rachael Hyland, WPIT

Environmental Scientist & Certified Ecologist

Professional Experience: 8 years

Rachael Hyland is an Environmental Scientist with extensive wetland and stream delineation and regulatory coordination experience. Rachael has a background in wetland and ecological habitat assessments in various states, most notably Washington, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Ohio. She has experience in assessing wetland, stream, riparian, and tidal systems, as well as complicated agricultural and disturbed sites. She currently performs wetland, stream, and shoreline delineations and fish and wildlife habitat assessments; conducts environmental code analysis; and

prepares environmental assessment and mitigation reports, biological evaluations, and permit applications to support clients through the regulatory and planning process for various land use projects. She also has extensive knowledge of bats and their associated habitats and white nose syndrome (*Pseudogymnoascus destructans*), a fungal disease affecting bats which was recently documented in Washington.

Rachael earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology from the University of Connecticut, with additional ecology studies at the graduate level. Rachael is a Wetland Professional in Training (WPIT) through the Society of Wetland Scientists as well as a Certified Ecologist through the Ecological Society of America. She has completed 40-hour wetland delineation training for Western Mountains, Valleys, & Coast and Arid West Regional Supplement, in addition to formal training for the Northcentral and Northeast supplement, and experience with the Midwest, Eastern Mountains and Piedmont, and Atlantic and Gulf Coast supplements. She has also received formal training from the Washington State Department of Ecology in the Using the Revised 2014 Wetland Rating System for Western Washington, How to Determine the Ordinary High Water Mark, Navigating SEPA, Selecting Wetland Mitigation Sites Using a Watershed Approach, and Wetland Classification. Rachael has also received training from the Washington State Department of Transportation in Biological Assessment Preparation for Transportation Projects and is listed by WSDOT as a junior author for preparing Biological Assessments.

Laura Livingston

Environmental Planner

Professional Experience: 7 years

Laura Livingston is an Environmental Planner with a background in water quality monitoring, invasive species monitoring, wildlife monitoring, wilderness stewardship, and erosion control projects. Laura has field experience working on natural resources projects, with an emphasis on stream and river projects, in the Northwest, Northeast, and Southwest United States. She has also worked on a variety of environmental science research, grant, and teaching projects requiring scientific writing, science communication, laboratory work, and statistical analysis. She currently performs ordinary high water delineations; conducts environmental code analysis; and prepares environmental assessment and mitigation reports, biological evaluations, and permit applications to support clients through the regulatory and planning process. Laura has a particular interest in shoreline projects and has prepared a variety of application materials to support projects within Shoreline Master Program jurisdictions.

Laura earned a Master of Science degree in Environmental Science from Washington State University, Pullman. In addition, she has received training from the Washington State Department of Ecology in How to Administer Shoreline Development Permits in Western Washington's Shorelines, Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark, the revised Washington State Wetland Rating System, Puget Sound Coastal Processes, How to Conduct a Forage Fish Survey, and Using the Credit-Debit Method for Estimating Mitigation Needs. Laura has also received training from the Washington State Department of Transportation in Biological Assessment Preparation for Transportation Projects and is listed by WSDOT as a junior author for preparing Biological Assessments.

Kelly Kramer

Environmental Scientist

Professional Experience: 4 years

Kelly Kramer is an Environmental Scientist with a diverse background in academic research, teaching and extension, as well as industry experience in agriculture. Kelly has expertise in scientific writing, college level teaching, research project management, data organization and statistical analysis, plant identification, forage extension, and farm and pasture management. Kelly has field experience performing in-depth pasture evaluations throughout central Kentucky, and professional experience managing client relations of a thoroughbred breeding farm.

Kelly earned a Master of Science degree in Integrated Plant and Soil Science, Graduate Certificate in College Teaching and Learning, and Bachelor of Science degree in Equine Science and Management from the University of Kentucky. Her graduate research focused on non-structural carbohydrate variation of cool-season grass pastures, and her graduate coursework included studying ecology of grazing lands in Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado. She has received 40-hour wetland delineation training (Western Mtns, Valleys, & Coast and Arid West Regional Supplement), and has been formally trained through the Coastal Training Program in Using Field Indicators for Hydric Soils, and by the Washington State Department of Ecology in the use of the Washington State Wetland Rating System. Kelly currently assists in wetland, stream, and shoreline delineations and fish and wildlife habitat assessments; conducts environmental code analysis; and prepares environmental assessment and mitigation reports, biological evaluations, and permit applications to support clients through the regulatory and planning process for various land use projects.