Report of Jurisdictional Waters Assessment Manufacturers Road Site Chattanooga, Tennessee S&ME Project No. 4181-16-068



Prepared for: Wingfield Scale Company, Inc. 2205 S. Holtzclaw Avenue Chattanooga, TN 37404

> Prepared by: S&ME, Inc. 4291 Highway 58, Ste 101 Chattanooga, TN 37416

> > December 13, 2016



December 13, 2016

Wingfield Scale Company, Inc. 2205 South Holtzclaw Avenue Chattanooga, TN 37404

Attention: Mr. Joseph Wingfield

Reference: **Report of Jurisdictional Waters Assessment** Manufacturers Road Site 408, 410, 418, and Western Portion of 100 Manufacturers Road Chattanooga, Tennessee S&ME Project No. 4181-16-068

Dear Mr. Wingfield:

S&ME, Inc. (S&ME) is pleased to submit this report of jurisdictional waters assessment for the above referenced project site in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The work was conducted in general conformance with the scope of services outlined in S&ME Proposal No. 41-1600689, dated November 16, 2016, and authorized by you on November 21, 2016. S&ME appreciates the opportunity to provide services for this project. If you have any questions, please call.

Sincerely,

S&ME, Inc.

Barry Burnetto, 5

F. Barry Burnette Staff Scientist

Kristy Smedley, MS, QH

Kristy Smealey, MS, Q Senior Scientist TNQHP 1021-TN11

Cc: Ms. Donna A. Shepherd, A.D. Engineering Services, Inc.



Table of Contents

| 1.0 | Project In | nformation1 |
|-----|------------|---|
| 2.0 | Methodo | ology1 |
| 3.0 | Results o | of Jurisdictional Waters Assessment2 |
| 3.1 | | In-House Review |
| 3.2 | | Field Observations2 |
| 3. | 2.1 | Stream Assessment |
| | 3.2.1.1 | S1 (WWC / Ephemeral Stream)2 |
| | 3.2.1.2 | S2 (WWC / Ephemeral Stream) |
| | 3.2.1.3 | S3-A (WWC / Intermittent Stream) |
| | 3.2.1.4 | S3-B (Stream / Intermittent Stream) |
| | 3.2.1.5 | S4 (Stream / Intermittent/Perennial Stream) |
| | 3.2.1.6 | S5 (WWC / Ephemeral Stream)4 |
| 3. | 2.2 | Wetland Assessment and Delineation4 |
| | 3.2.2.1 | Wetland 14 |
| 4.0 | Conclusi | ions and Recommendations5 |

Appendices

Appendix I – Figures Appendix II – Photographs Appendix III – Field Data Sheets



1.0 Project Information

The project site is located on the south side of Manufacturers Road and encompasses approximately 8 acres of land. The site is comprised of three separate, contiguous parcels, and a portion of a fourth. According to the Hamilton County GIS website, project site parcels included Parcel 135F H 007.04 (418 Manufacturers Road (1.34 acres)); Parcel 135F H 007 (410 Manufacturers Road (1.4 acres)); Parcel 135F H 007.05 (408 Manufacturers Road (2.14 acres)); and the western portion of Parcel 135F H 004 (100 Manufacturers Road (about 3 acres)). Our understanding of the project is based on information provided by Ms. Donna Shepherd of A.D. Engineering Services to Ms. Kristy Smedley of S&ME via email on November 14, 2016. S&ME was requested to evaluate the project site for potential jurisdictional waters to assist in the evaluation of the site for potential future use and/or development.

2.0 Methodology

Jurisdictional waters of the U.S., including wetlands, are defined by 33 CFR Part 328.3 and are protected by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1344), which is administered and enforced by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Tennessee Department of Environmental and Conservation-Division of Water Resources (TDEC-DWR) has jurisdiction over waters of the state. The wetland assessment was performed using the Routine On-Site Determination Method as defined in the Corps of Engineers *1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual* and *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual*: *Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region*.¹ This technique uses a multi-parameter approach, which requires positive evidence of three criteria: hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology. Areas exhibiting all three wetland characteristics, as well as surface waters, are considered jurisdictional.

Our assessment for the possible occurrence of jurisdictional waters, including wetlands, within the project site consisted of using a combination of in-house research and field reconnaissance. In-house research included: 1) a review of the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic map of the Chattanooga, Tennessee quadrangle (dated 1969, photo revised 1976); 2) review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map for the above-referenced quadrangle (reviewed online at http://wetlandsfws.er.usgs.gov/); 3) review of the web soil survey for Hamilton County, Tennessee published by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service; and 4) review of a 2014 aerial photograph of the site (obtained from Google Earth[®]). Subsequent to the inhouse review, jurisdictional waters of the U.S., including wetlands, were assessed in the field employing the USACE methodology referenced above.

We evaluated drainage features according to the TDEC Guidance for Making Hydrologic Determinations, Version 1.4. The procedures outlined in this guidance are intended to be applied to drainage features that could be considered either a wet-weather conveyance (WWC) or a stream. A score of less than 19 indicates the feature meets the definition of a wet-weather conveyance and a score of 19 or greater indicates the feature is a stream. Typically, features considered to be a stream by TDEC would be

¹ Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C., 100 pp. plus appendices, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2012. *Final Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region*, ed. J. S. Wakeley, R. W. Lichvar, C. V. Noble, and J. F. Berkowitz. ERDC/EL TR-10-9. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.



considered an intermittent or perennial stream by the USACE. Copies of the TDEC Hydrologic Determination Field Data Sheets for the observed features are included in Appendix III. Our opinion of the stream type for both agencies is included in Section 3.2 below.

3.0 Results of Jurisdictional Waters Assessment

S&ME evaluated the soils, vegetation, and hydrology within two suspect areas that were located within the project site. The results are summarized in the sections below, and the features identified correspond to the areas depicted on Figure 4 in Appendix I. S&ME conducted the field assessment on December 2, 2016, which was about 46 hours after the most recent rain event of approximately 4 inches that occurred on November 30, 2016.

3.1 In-House Review

No wetlands are depicted within the project site on NWI map reviewed. The Tennessee River is located on the southern boundary of the project site. An unnamed tributary of the Tennessee River is depicted in the project site on the topographic map reviewed. The soil survey information reviewed depicts the subject property as being underlain by the Arents (ArB) and Enders-Urban land complex (2 to 12 percent slopes) (EhC). Both Arents and Enders-Urban land complex soils are characterized as soils that have been altered or covered during development so that it is not feasible to classify soil types. The 2014 aerial photograph reviewed indicates that the eastern portion of the project site is undeveloped, wooded land, and the western portion is grassed field. What appears to be an area of standing water is visible in the aerial photograph in the western portion of the site. The area of standing water appears to connect to the Tennessee River, on the southern boundary of the site. Figure 1 in Appendix I depicts the topographic map that includes the site and vicinity. The NWI map for the project site is included in Appendix I as Figure 2. Figure 3 in Appendix I is the USDA Soil Survey map depicting the project site.

3.2 Field Observations

3.2.1 Stream Assessment

On December 2, 2016, an S&ME Qualified Hydrologic Professional (QHP), trained in the TDEC Guidance for Making Hydrologic Determinations, performed the evaluation of the site to identify and characterize on-site drainage features. The following drainage features were observed.

3.2.1.1 <u>S1 (WWC / Ephemeral Stream)</u>

A drainage feature was observed in the northeastern section of the wooded portion of the project site, behind the north-adjoining, multi-tenant, residential property. The feature continued in a southeasterly direction for approximately 145 feet before entering another drainage feature (S3-B). Water was observed in one pooled area along the reach; no flowing water or other areas of standing water were observed in this feature. This drainage feature scored a 10.5 on the TDEC Hydrologic Determination Field Data Sheet (included in Appendix B) and is considered to be a WWC. In our opinion, this feature would also be considered an ephemeral stream by the USACE. The feature is depicted on Figure 4 as S1, and in photograph 1.



3.2.1.2 <u>S2 (WWC / Ephemeral Stream)</u>

A drainage feature was observed beginning at the northern boundary of the subject site, behind the north-adjoining, multi-tenant, residential property. The feature begins on the north-adjoining property and is concrete-lined as it enters the subject site. The drainage continues onto the subject site for approximately 60 feet until entering a wetland area (Wetland 1). For the next approximately 50 feet through Wetland 1, it appeared to continue as a broad sheet flow drainage with no defined channel, until reaching another drainage feature (S3-B) on the west side of the wetland area. No flowing or standing water was observed in this feature at the time of our site visit. This drainage feature scored a 6.5 on the TDEC Hydrologic Determination Field Data Sheet (included in Appendix B) and is considered to be a WWC. In our opinion, this feature would also be considered an ephemeral stream by the USACE. The feature is depicted on Figure 4 as S2, and in photograph 2.

3.2.1.3 <u>S3-A (WWC / Intermittent Stream)</u>

Another drainage feature was observed beginning at the northern boundary of the subject site, behind the north-adjoining, multi-tenant, residential property, just west of S2 (discussed above). It was designated as S3-A to distinguish it from the downstream portion described below as S3-B. At the time of our site visit, S3-A was observed flowing from a subsurface seep on the subject site. The feature proceeded within a channel generally to the south from the seep for approximately 60 feet south until entering a wetland area (Wetland 1), where it dissipated and appeared to return to the subsurface. Evidence of a broader sheet flow drainage through the wetland area with no defined channel was observed. This portion of the drainage feature scored a 15.5 on the TDEC Hydrologic Determination Field Data Sheet (included in Appendix B) and is considered to be a WWC. In our opinion, this feature would also be considered an intermittent stream by the USACE. The feature is depicted on Figure 4 as S3-A, and in photographs 3 and 4.

3.2.1.4 <u>S3-B (Stream / Intermittent Stream)</u>

This portion of S3 was observed beginning at a pool on the west side of a wetland area was interpreted to be a continuation of S3-A. Flowing water was observed in this portion of the feature at the time of our site visit. The stream proceeded generally to the southwest for approximately 130 feet before entering another stream (S4, discussed below). S3-B scored a 24 on the TDEC Hydrologic Determination Field Data Sheet (included in Appendix B) and is considered to be a Stream. In our opinion, this feature would also be considered an intermittent stream by the USACE. The feature is depicted on Figure 4 as S3-B, and in photographs 5 through 7.

3.2.1.5 <u>S4 (Stream / Intermittent/Perennial Stream)</u>

This stream enters the subject site at a culvert that receives water from the adjoining eastern property occupied by a constructed water feature at Renaissance Park. This stream is depicted as a solid blue line on the topographic map and is evident in the aerial photographs reviewed (see Section 3.1). The reviewed topographic map, which is dated prior to construction of the adjoining property water feature, depicts the feature as an unnamed tributary/back water of the Tennessee River. The stream is approximately 20 feet wide on the subject site and was flowing at the time of our site visit. It continues from the eastern boundary of the subject site approximately 280 feet west, before turning generally to the south for approximately 365 feet before entering the Tennessee River. Water levels in the southern approxaitemly 365 feet appeared to match Tennessee River water levels. The TDEC Hydrologic



Determination Field Data Sheet (included in Appendix B) indicates the presence of fish as a Primary Field Indicator of a stream. Several sunfish (*Lepomis* sp.) were observed during site reconnaissance activities. Based on the presence of fish other than *Gambusia* sp., the feature would be considered a Stream by the TDEC, and an intermittent or perennial stream by the USACE. The feature is depicted on Figure 4 as S4, and in photographs 7 through 9.

3.2.1.6 <u>S5 (WWC / Ephemeral Stream)</u>

A drainage feature was observed on the west side of the wooded portion of the subject site, beginning at the drain pipe from beneath the adjoining gravel drive. It continued approximately 50 feet to the east until entering S4 (discussed above). No flowing water or areas of standing water were observed in this feature at the time of our site visit. This drainage feature scored an 8 on the TDEC Hydrologic Determination Field Data Sheet (included in Appendix B) and is considered to be a WWC. In our opinion, this feature would also be considered an ephemeral stream by the USACE. The feature is depicted on Figure 3 as S5, and in photograph 10.

3.2.2 Wetland Assessment and Delineation

According to the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region (April 2012), an area must meet three criteria to be considered a jurisdictional wetland. The three criteria are hydric soils, hydrophytic vegetation, and wetland hydrology. If any one of the three criteria is absent, the area is not considered a jurisdictional wetland.

S&ME performed a field review of the project site, investigating low-lying areas that may have the potential for extended periods of saturation, as well as areas shown on the topographic map and aerial photographs that appeared to contain standing water, saturation, or stormwater conveyances. During the course of our field services, S&ME identified one area of potential jurisdictional wetlands as discussed below (see Figure 4).

3.2.2.1 <u>Wetland 1</u>

This low-lying area contained several indicators of hydrology during our site visit, including surface water, saturation, water stained leaves, and drainage patterns. The wetland area obtains hydrologic input from topographically higher areas to the north and northeast, along with contributions from S2 and S3-A (discussed above).

Soils were evaluated utilizing the Munsell soil color chart and exhibited hydric characteristics that met the definition of the F3- Depleted Matrix hydric soil indicator. The upper six inches of the soil within the wetland generally possessed a matrix chroma and value of 2.5Y 3/2 with redoximorphic features of 5YR 3/4.

Within the wetland, the dominant hydrophytic vegetation observed included box elder (*Acer negundo*), smartweed (*Persicaria hydropiperoides*), and giant cane (*Arundinaria gigantea*). A detailed description of the wetland area within a specific data plot, along with a corresponding upland data form, can be found in the attached USACE Routine Wetland Determination Data Forms. We understand that a certified land surveyor will be recording the locations of the wetland boundaries delineated by S&ME.



4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

S&ME conducted a jurisdictional waters assessment on the project site and identified a one Stream/intermittent or perennial stream, one Stream/intermittent stream, one WWC/intermittent stream, three WWC/ephemeral streams, and one wetland. All wetland delineations and stream determinations are preliminary until verified by the USACE and TDEC-DWR and should be used for planning purposes only until the verification is complete. If future project plans propose to impact the identified features, written agency concurrence will be a required component of the permit applications. Following your approval, S&ME will submit this report along with a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) Request form to the USACE concerning potential jurisdictional Water of the United States. We will copy the TDEC-DWR to request concurrence and document the presence of Waters of the State. Appendices

Appendix I – Figures









Appendix II – Photographs















S&ME Project No. 4181-16-068







S&ME Project No. 4181-16-068





S&ME Project No. 4181-16-068



Appendix III - Field Data Forms

Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control, Version 1.4

| County: Hamilton Named Waterbody: n/a | | Date/Time: 12/2/16; 11:00 am | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Assessors/Affiliation: KS & BB of S& | Project ID: S1 | | | | | |
| Site Name/Description: Manufacture | rs Road Site | | | | | |
| Site Location: 408 Manufacturers Ro | pad | | | | | |
| USGS quad: Chattanooga | Lat/Long: 35.061242, -85.312965 | | | | | |
| Previous Rainfall (7-days) : Novembe | r 30 th (4.01 inches) | | | | | |
| Precipitation this Season vs. Normal Source of recent & seasonal precip of | dry drought unknown | | | | | |
| Watershed Size : | circle) Number : | | | | | |
| Soil Type(s) / Geology : Arents and Enders-Urban land complex Source: USDA Web Soil Survey | | | | | | |
| Surrounding Land Use : Commercial / Industrial / Multi-tenant residential | | | | | | |
| Degree of historical alteration to nat Severe | ural channel morphology & hydrology (c Moderate | ircle one & describe fully in Notes) : Absent | | | | |

Primary Field Indicators Observed

| Primary Indicators | NO | YES |
|---|-----|--------|
| 1. Hydrologic feature exists solely due to a process discharge | Х | WWC |
| 2. Defined bed and bank absent, dominated by upland vegetation / grass | Х | WWC |
| Watercourse dry anytime during February through April 15th, under normal precipitation / groundwater conditions | N/A | WWC |
| 4. Daily flow and precipitation records showing feature only flows in direct response to rainfall | х | WWC |
| Presence of multiple populations of obligate lotic organisms with ≥ 2 month aquatic phase | Х | Stream |
| 6. Presence of fish (except Gambusia) | Х | Stream |
| 7. Presence of naturally occurring ground water table connection | Х | Stream |
| 8. Flowing water in channel and 7 days since last precipitation in local watershed | Х | Stream |
| 9. Evidence watercourse has been used as a supply of drinking water | Х | Stream |

NOTE : If any Primary Indicators 1-9 = "Yes", then STOP; absent directly contradictory evidence, determination is complete.

In the absence of a primary indicator, or other definitive evidence, complete the secondary indicator table on page 2 of this sheet, and provide score below.

Guidance for the interpretation and scoring of both the primary & secondary indicators is provided in TDEC-WPC Guidance For Making Hydrologic Determinations, Version 1.4

Overall Hydrologic Determination = WWC

Secondary Indicator Score (if applicable) = 10.5

Justification / Notes : Slight historical alteration to natural channel morphology due to surrounding development increasing runoff amounts and locations.

Secondary Field Indicator Evaluation

| A. Geomorphology (Subtotal = 6) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 1. Continuous bed and bank | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 2. Sinuous channel | 0 | Ο | 2 | 3 |
| 3. In-channel structure: riffle-pool sequences | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Sorting of soil textures or other substrate | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Active/relic floodplain | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Depositional bars or benches | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Braided channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Recent alluvial deposits | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 9. Natural levees | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Headcuts | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11. Grade controls | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 12. Natural valley or drainageway | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 13. At least second order channel on existing USGS or NRCS map | No = | 0 | Yes | = 3 |

| B. Hydrology (Subtotal = 2.5) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|---|--------|-------|----------|--------|
| 14. Subsurface flow/discharge into channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15. Water in channel and >48 hours since sig. rain ** | 0 | Ð | 2 | 3 |
| 16. Leaf litter in channel (January – September) N/A | 1.5 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 |
| 17. Sediment on plants or on debris | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 18. Organic debris lines or piles (wrack lines) | 0 | 0.5 | (1) | 1.5 |
| 19. Hydric soils in stream bed or sides of channel | No | = 0 > | Yes = | = 1.5 |

| C. Biology (Subtotal = 2) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 20. Fibrous roots in channel ¹ N/A | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. Rooted plants in channel ¹ | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 22. Crayfish in stream (exclude in floodplain) | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 23. Bivalves/mussels | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24. Amphibians | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 25. Macrobenthos (record type & abundance) | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 26. Filamentous algae; periphyton | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 27. Iron oxidizing bacteria/fungus | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 28.Wetland plants in channel ² | | 0.5 | 1 | 2 |

¹ Focus is on the presence of upland plants. ² Focus is on the presence of aquatic or wetland plants.

| Total Points = | 10.5 |
|----------------|------|
| | |

Under Normal Conditions, Watercourse is a Wet Weather Conveyance if Secondary Indicator Score < 19 points

Notes : **- Approximately 46 Hours since most recent rain. #20. Channel incised below root bearing zone.

Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control, Version 1.4

| County: Hamilton Named Waterbody: n/a | | Date/Time: 12/2/16; 12:10 pm | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Assessors/Affiliation: KS & BB of S& | Project ID : S2 | | | | | |
| Site Name/Description: Manufacture | rs Road Site | | | | | |
| Site Location: 408 Manufacturers Ro | ad | | | | | |
| USGS quad: Chattanooga | Lat/Long: 35.061541, -85.312437 | | | | | |
| Previous Rainfall (7-days) : Novembe | r 30 th (4.01 inches) | | | | | |
| Precipitation this Season vs. Normal Source of recent & seasonal precip of | dry drought unknown | | | | | |
| Watershed Size : | circle) Number : | | | | | |
| Soil Type(s) / Geology : Arents and Enders-Urban land complex Source: USDA Web Soil Survey | | | | | | |
| Surrounding Land Use : Commercial / Industrial / Multi-tenant residential | | | | | | |
| Degree of historical alteration to nat Severe | ural channel morphology & hydrology (ci | rcle one & describe fully in Notes) : Absent | | | | |

Primary Field Indicators Observed

| Primary Indicators | NO | YES |
|---|-----|--------|
| 1. Hydrologic feature exists solely due to a process discharge | Х | WWC |
| 2. Defined bed and bank absent, dominated by upland vegetation / grass | Х | WWC |
| Watercourse dry anytime during February through April 15th, under normal precipitation / groundwater conditions | N/A | WWC |
| 4. Daily flow and precipitation records showing feature only flows in direct response to rainfall | х | WWC |
| Presence of multiple populations of obligate lotic organisms with ≥ 2 month aquatic phase | Х | Stream |
| 6. Presence of fish (except Gambusia) | Х | Stream |
| 7. Presence of naturally occurring ground water table connection | Х | Stream |
| 8. Flowing water in channel and 7 days since last precipitation in local watershed | Х | Stream |
| 9. Evidence watercourse has been used as a supply of drinking water | Х | Stream |

NOTE : If any Primary Indicators 1-9 = "Yes", then STOP; absent directly contradictory evidence, determination is complete.

In the absence of a primary indicator, or other definitive evidence, complete the secondary indicator table on page 2 of this sheet, and provide score below.

Guidance for the interpretation and scoring of both the primary & secondary indicators is provided in TDEC-WPC Guidance For Making Hydrologic Determinations, Version 1.4

Overall Hydrologic Determination = WWC

Secondary Indicator Score (if applicable) = 6.5

Justification / Notes : Historical alteration to natural channel morphology due to surrounding development increasing runoff amounts and locations.

Secondary Field Indicator Evaluation

| A. Geomorphology (Subtotal = 4.5) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 1. Continuous bed and bank | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Sinuous channel | 0 | Θ | 2 | 3 |
| 3. In-channel structure: riffle-pool sequences | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Sorting of soil textures or other substrate | 0 | Ο | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Active/relic floodplain | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Depositional bars or benches | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Braided channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Recent alluvial deposits | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 9. Natural levees | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Headcuts | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11. Grade controls | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 12. Natural valley or drainageway | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 13. At least second order channel on existing USGS or NRCS map | No = | 0 | Yes | = 3 |

| B. Hydrology (Subtotal = 1) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|---|--------|-------|----------|--------|
| 14. Subsurface flow/discharge into channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15. Water in channel and >48 hours since sig. rain ** | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 16. Leaf litter in channel (January – September) N/A | 1.5 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 |
| 17. Sediment on plants or on debris | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 18. Organic debris lines or piles (wrack lines) | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 19. Hydric soils in stream bed or sides of channel | No | = 0 > | Yes = | = 1.5 |

| C. Biology (Subtotal = 1) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 20. Fibrous roots in channel ¹ | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. Rooted plants in channel ¹ | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Crayfish in stream (exclude in floodplain) | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 23. Bivalves/mussels | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24. Amphibians | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 25. Macrobenthos (record type & abundance) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 26. Filamentous algae; periphyton | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 27. Iron oxidizing bacteria/fungus | 6 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 28.Wetland plants in channel ² | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 2 |

¹ Focus is on the presence of upland plants. ² Focus is on the presence of aquatic or wetland plants.

Total Points = <u>6.5</u>

Under Normal Conditions, Watercourse is a Wet Weather Conveyance if Secondary Indicator Score < 19 points

Notes :#10 – observed headcut was concrete in stormwater runnoff channel from adjoining property.

** - Approximately 46 Hours since most recent rain.

Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control, Version 1.4

| County: Hamilton | Named Waterbody: n/a | Date/Time: 12/2/16; 12:25 pm | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Assessors/Affiliation: KS & BB of S& | ME, Inc. | Project ID : S3A | | | | |
| Site Name/Description: Manufacture | rs Road Site | | | | | |
| Site Location: 408 Manufacturers Ro | ad | | | | | |
| USGS quad: Chattanooga | HUC (12 digit): 06020001001T_0200 | Lat/Long: 35.061380, -85.312484 | | | | |
| Previous Rainfall (7-days) : Novembe | | | | | | |
| Precipitation this Season vs. Normal Source of recent & seasonal precip of | dry drought unknown | | | | | |
| Watershed Size : | circle) Number : | | | | | |
| Soil Type(s) / Geology : Arents and Enders-Urban land complex source: USDA Web Soil Survey | | | | | | |
| Surrounding Land Use : Commercial / Industrial / Multi-tenant residential | | | | | | |
| Degree of historical alteration to natural channel morphology & hydrology (circle one & describe full Severe Moderate Slight Absent | | | | | | |

Primary Field Indicators Observed

| Primary Indicators | NO | YES |
|---|-----|--------|
| 1. Hydrologic feature exists solely due to a process discharge | Х | WWC |
| 2. Defined bed and bank absent, dominated by upland vegetation / grass | Х | WWC |
| Watercourse dry anytime during February through April 15th, under normal precipitation / groundwater conditions | N/A | WWC |
| 4. Daily flow and precipitation records showing feature only flows in direct response to rainfall | х | WWC |
| Presence of multiple populations of obligate lotic organisms with ≥ 2 month aquatic phase | х | Stream |
| 6. Presence of fish (except <i>Gambusia</i>) | Х | Stream |
| 7. Presence of naturally occurring ground water table connection | Х | Stream |
| 8. Flowing water in channel and 7 days since last precipitation in local watershed | Х | Stream |
| 9. Evidence watercourse has been used as a supply of drinking water | Х | Stream |

NOTE : If any Primary Indicators 1-9 = "Yes", then STOP; absent directly contradictory evidence, determination is complete.

In the absence of a primary indicator, or other definitive evidence, complete the secondary indicator table on page 2 of this sheet, and provide score below.

Guidance for the interpretation and scoring of both the primary & secondary indicators is provided in *TDEC-WPC Guidance For Making Hydrologic Determinations, Version 1.4*

Overall Hydrologic Determination = WWC

Secondary Indicator Score (if applicable) = 15.5

Secondary Field Indicator Evaluation

| A. Geomorphology (Subtotal = 3) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 1. Continuous bed and bank | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 2. Sinuous channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. In-channel structure: riffle-pool sequences | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Sorting of soil textures or other substrate | 0 | Ο | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Active/relic floodplain | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Depositional bars or benches | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Braided channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Recent alluvial deposits | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 9. Natural levees | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Headcuts | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11. Grade controls | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 12. Natural valley or drainageway | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 13. At least second order channel on existing USGS or NRCS map | No = 0 | | Yes = 3 | |

| B. Hydrology (Subtotal = 7.5) | Γ | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|-----|--------|-------|----------|--------|
| 14. Subsurface flow/discharge into channel | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15. Water in channel and >48 hours since sig. rain | ** | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 16. Leaf litter in channel (January – September) | N/A | 1.5 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 |
| 17. Sediment on plants or on debris | | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 18. Organic debris lines or piles (wrack lines) | | 0 | 0.5 | 6 | 1.5 |
| 19. Hydric soils in stream bed or sides of channel | | | = 0 > | Yes = | = 1.5 |

| C. Biology (Subtotal = 5) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 20. Fibrous roots in channel ¹ | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. Rooted plants in channel ¹ | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 22. Crayfish in stream (exclude in floodplain) | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 23. Bivalves/mussels | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24. Amphibians | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 25. Macrobenthos (record type & abundance) | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 26. Filamentous algae; periphyton | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 27. Iron oxidizing bacteria/fungus | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 28.Wetland plants in channel ² | | 0.5 | 1 | 2 |

¹ Focus is on the presence of upland plants. ² Focus is on the presence of aquatic or wetland plants.

Total Points = <u>15.5</u>

Under Normal Conditions, Watercourse is a Wet Weather Conveyance if Secondary Indicator Score < 19 points

Notes :#14 – observed subsurface flow from hole at start of feature.

** - Approximately 46 Hours since most recent rain.

Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control, Version 1.4

| County: Hamilton | Named Waterbody: n/a | Date/Time: 12/2/16; 12:40 pm | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Assessors/Affiliation: KS & BB of S& | Project ID: S3B | | | | | |
| Site Name/Description: Manufacture | rs Road Site | | | | | |
| Site Location: 408 Manufacturers Ro | ad | | | | | |
| USGS quad: Chattanooga | JSGS quad: Chattanooga HUC (12 digit): 06020001001T_0200 | | | | | |
| Previous Rainfall (7-days) : Novembe | | | | | | |
| Precipitation this Season vs. Normal Source of recent & seasonal precip of | dry drought unknown | | | | | |
| Watershed Size : | circle) Number : | | | | | |
| Soil Type(s) / Geology : Arents and Enders-Urban land complex Source: USDA Web Soil Survey | | | | | | |
| Surrounding Land Use : Commercial / Industrial / Multi-tenant residential | | | | | | |
| Degree of historical alteration to natural channel morphology & hydrology (circle one & describe fu Severe Moderate Slight Absent | | | | | | |

Primary Field Indicators Observed

| Primary Indicators | NO | YES |
|---|-----|--------|
| 1. Hydrologic feature exists solely due to a process discharge | Х | WWC |
| 2. Defined bed and bank absent, dominated by upland vegetation / grass | Х | WWC |
| Watercourse dry anytime during February through April 15th, under normal precipitation / groundwater conditions | N/A | WWC |
| 4. Daily flow and precipitation records showing feature only flows in direct response to rainfall | х | WWC |
| Presence of multiple populations of obligate lotic organisms with ≥ 2 month aquatic phase | х | Stream |
| 6. Presence of fish (except <i>Gambusia</i>) | Х | Stream |
| 7. Presence of naturally occurring ground water table connection | Х | Stream |
| 8. Flowing water in channel and 7 days since last precipitation in local watershed | Х | Stream |
| 9. Evidence watercourse has been used as a supply of drinking water | Х | Stream |

NOTE : If any Primary Indicators 1-9 = "Yes", then STOP; absent directly contradictory evidence, determination is complete.

In the absence of a primary indicator, or other definitive evidence, complete the secondary indicator table on page 2 of this sheet, and provide score below.

Guidance for the interpretation and scoring of both the primary & secondary indicators is provided in *TDEC-WPC Guidance For Making Hydrologic Determinations, Version 1.4*

Overall Hydrologic Determination = Stream

Secondary Indicator Score (if applicable) = 24

Secondary Field Indicator Evaluation

| A. Geomorphology (Subtotal = 10) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 1. Continuous bed and bank | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Sinuous channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. In-channel structure: riffle-pool sequences | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 4. Sorting of soil textures or other substrate | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 5. Active/relic floodplain | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Depositional bars or benches | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Braided channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Recent alluvial deposits | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 9. Natural levees | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Headcuts | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11. Grade controls | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 12. Natural valley or drainageway | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 13. At least second order channel on existing USGS or NRCS map | No = 0 | | Yes = 3 | |

| B. Hydrology (Subtotal = 7) | | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|---|----|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 14. Subsurface flow/discharge into channel | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15. Water in channel and >48 hours since sig. rain | ** | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 16. Leaf litter in channel (January – September) N/ | Ά | 1.5 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 |
| 17. Sediment on plants or on debris | | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 18. Organic debris lines or piles (wrack lines) | | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 19. Hydric soils in stream bed or sides of channel | | | = 0 | Yes = | = 1.5 |

| C. Biology (Subtotal = 6) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 20. Fibrous roots in channel ¹ | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. Rooted plants in channel ¹ | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 22. Crayfish in stream (exclude in floodplain) | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 23. Bivalves/mussels | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24. Amphibians | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 25. Macrobenthos (record type & abundance) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 26. Filamentous algae; periphyton | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 27. Iron oxidizing bacteria/fungus | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 28.Wetland plants in channel ² | | 0.5 | 1 | 2 |

¹ Focus is on the presence of upland plants. ² Focus is on the presence of aquatic or wetland plants.

Total Points = 24

Under Normal Conditions, Watercourse is a Wet Weather Conveyance if Secondary Indicator Score < 19 points

Notes : ** - Approximately 46 hours since most recent rain.

Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control, Version 1.4

| County: Hamilton | Named Waterbody: n/a | | Date/Time: 12/2/16; 2:10 pm | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Assessors/Affiliation: KS & BB of S& | ME, Inc. | | Project ID: S4 | | | |
| Site Name/Description: Manufacture | rs Road Site | | | | | |
| Site Location: 408 Manufacturers Ro | | | | | | |
| USGS quad: Chattanooga | HUC (12 digit): 0602000 | 01001T_0200 | Lat/Long: 35.061002, -85.312724 | | | |
| Previous Rainfall (7-days) : Novembe | | | | | | |
| Precipitation this Season vs. Normal : very wet wet average Source of recent & seasonal precip data : Weather Underground website | | | dry drought unknown | | | |
| Watershed Size : Photos Y r N (c | | | circle) Number : | | | |
| Soil Type(s) / Geology : Arents and Enders-Urban land complex Source: USDA Web Soil Survey | | | | | | |
| Surrounding Land Use : Commercial / Industrial / Multi-tenant residential | | | | | | |
| Degree of historical alteration to natural channel morphology & hydrology (circle one & describe fully in Not Severe Moderate Slight Absent | | | | | | |

Primary Field Indicators Observed

| Primary Indicators | NO | YES |
|---|-----|--------|
| 1. Hydrologic feature exists solely due to a process discharge | Х | WWC |
| 2. Defined bed and bank absent, dominated by upland vegetation / grass | Х | WWC |
| Watercourse dry anytime during February through April 15th, under normal precipitation / groundwater conditions | N/A | WWC |
| 4. Daily flow and precipitation records showing feature only flows in direct response to rainfall | х | WWC |
| Presence of multiple populations of obligate lotic organisms with ≥ 2 month aquatic phase | Х | Stream |
| 6. Presence of fish (except Gambusia) | | Stream |
| 7. Presence of naturally occurring ground water table connection | Х | Stream |
| 8. Flowing water in channel and 7 days since last precipitation in local watershed | Х | Stream |
| 9. Evidence watercourse has been used as a supply of drinking water | Х | Stream |

NOTE : If any Primary Indicators 1-9 = "Yes", then STOP; absent directly contradictory evidence, determination is complete.

In the absence of a primary indicator, or other definitive evidence, complete the secondary indicator table on page 2 of this sheet, and provide score below.

Guidance for the interpretation and scoring of both the primary & secondary indicators is provided in *TDEC-WPC Guidance For Making Hydrologic Determinations, Version 1.4*

Overall Hydrologic Determination = Stream

Secondary Indicator Score (if applicable) =

Stream connects directly to Tennessee River and fluctuates with river flow regime. Stream Flows from constructed water feature at Renaissance Park on adjoining property. *Lepomis* sp. observed in stream.

Tennessee Division of Water Pollution Control, Version 1.4

| County: Hamilton | Named Waterbody: n/a | Date/Time: 12/2/16; 3:00 pm | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Assessors/Affiliation: KS & BB of S& | ME, Inc. | Project ID: S5 | |
| Site Name/Description: Manufacture | me/Description: Manufacturers Road Site | | |
| Site Location: 408 Manufacturers Ro | pad | | |
| USGS quad: Chattanooga | HUC (12 digit): 06020001001T_0200 | Lat/Long: 35.060991, -85.312909 | |
| Previous Rainfall (7-days) : Novembe | r 30 th (4.01 inches) | | |
| Precipitation this Season vs. Normal Source of recent & seasonal precipe | : very wet wet average data : Weather Underground website | dry drought unknown | |
| Watershed Size : | Photos: Yor N (| circle) Number : | |
| Soil Type(s) / Geology : Arents and I Source: USDA Web Soil Survey | Enders-Urban land complex | | |
| Surrounding Land Use : Commercial | / Industrial / Multi-tenant residential | | |
| Degree of historical alteration to nat Severe | ural channel morphology & hydrology (c Moderate | ircle one & describe fully in Notes) : Absent | |

Primary Field Indicators Observed

| Primary Indicators | NO | YES |
|---|-----|--------|
| 1. Hydrologic feature exists solely due to a process discharge | Х | WWC |
| 2. Defined bed and bank absent, dominated by upland vegetation / grass | Х | WWC |
| Watercourse dry anytime during February through April 15th, under normal precipitation / groundwater conditions | N/A | WWC |
| 4. Daily flow and precipitation records showing feature only flows in direct response to rainfall | х | WWC |
| Presence of multiple populations of obligate lotic organisms with ≥ 2 month aquatic phase | Х | Stream |
| 6. Presence of fish (except Gambusia) | Х | Stream |
| 7. Presence of naturally occurring ground water table connection | Х | Stream |
| 8. Flowing water in channel and 7 days since last precipitation in local watershed | Х | Stream |
| 9. Evidence watercourse has been used as a supply of drinking water | Х | Stream |

NOTE : If any Primary Indicators 1-9 = "Yes", then STOP; absent directly contradictory evidence, determination is complete.

In the absence of a primary indicator, or other definitive evidence, complete the secondary indicator table on page 2 of this sheet, and provide score below.

Guidance for the interpretation and scoring of both the primary & secondary indicators is provided in TDEC-WPC Guidance For Making Hydrologic Determinations, Version 1.4

Overall Hydrologic Determination = WWC

Secondary Indicator Score (if applicable) = 8

Justification / Notes : Alteration to natural channel morphology due to periodic high runoff amounts from culvert from adjoining property deeply incising channel at culvert outfall.

Secondary Field Indicator Evaluation

| A. Geomorphology (Subtotal = 4) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 1. Continuous bed and bank | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Sinuous channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. In-channel structure: riffle-pool sequences | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Sorting of soil textures or other substrate | 0 | Ο | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Active/relic floodplain | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Depositional bars or benches | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Braided channel | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Recent alluvial deposits | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 9. Natural levees | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Headcuts | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11. Grade controls | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 12. Natural valley or drainageway | | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 13. At least second order channel on existing USGS or NRCS map | No = | 0 | Yes | = 3 |

| B. Hydrology (Subtotal = 1) | Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|---|--------|------|----------|--------|
| 14. Subsurface flow/discharge into channel | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15. Water in channel and >48 hours since sig. rain ** | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 16. Leaf litter in channel (January – September) N/A | 1.5 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 |
| 17. Sediment on plants or on debris | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 18. Organic debris lines or piles (wrack lines) | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 19. Hydric soils in stream bed or sides of channel | No | = 0 | Yes = | = 1.5 |

| C. Biology (Subtotal = 3) | [| Absent | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
|--|-----|------------|------|----------|--------|
| 20. Fibrous roots in channel ¹ | N/A | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. Rooted plants in channel ¹ | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 22. Crayfish in stream (exclude in floodplain) | | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 23. Bivalves/mussels | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24. Amphibians | | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 25. Macrobenthos (record type & abundance) | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 26. Filamentous algae; periphyton | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 27. Iron oxidizing bacteria/fungus | | 6 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 28.Wetland plants in channel ² | | \bigcirc | 0.5 | 1 | 2 |

¹ Focus is on the presence of upland plants. ² Focus is on the presence of aquatic or wetland plants.

Total Points = <u>8</u>

Under Normal Conditions, Watercourse is a Wet Weather Conveyance if Secondary Indicator Score < 19 points

Notes ** - Approximately 46 Hours since most recent rain.

#20. Channel incised below root bearing zone.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Eastern Mountains and Piedmont

| Project/Site: Manufacturers Road Site | City/County: Chatt | tanooga / F | lamilton | Sampling Date: 12 | 2/2/16 |
|--|---|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Applicant/Owner | | | State. TN | Sampling Point | W1/DP-1 |
| Investigator(a): K. Smedley & B. Burnette of S&ME, Inc. | Soction Township | Pango: | | | |
| depression | | , italiye | | 0. | w. 1% |
| Landform (nillslope, terrace, etc.):L | Local reliet (concave, o | convex, none | 12054 | Slope | (%): <u></u> |
| Subregion (LRR or MLRA): LINC Lat: 55.001440 | | Long: -00.0 | 12034 | Datum: | NAD03 |
| Soil Map Unit Name: Arents (ArB) and Enders-Urban land col | mplex (EhC) | | NWI classifica | tion: N/A | |
| Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of | year? Yes 🖌 N | lo (If | no, explain in Re | marks.) | |
| Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significant | ly disturbed? A | Are "Normal C | Circumstances" pro | esent?Yes 🖌 | No |
| Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally p | oroblematic? (I | lf needed, ex | plain any answers | in Remarks.) | |
| SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showir | ng sampling poir | nt locatior | ns, transects, | important feat | tures, etc. |
| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ✓ No Hydric Soil Present? Yes ✓ No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ✓ No Remarks: Image: Comparison of the second | Is the Sampwithin a We | pled Area etland? | Yes_ | No | |
| HYDROLOGY | | | | | |
| Wetland Hydrology Indicators: | | 5 | Secondary Indicate | ors (minimum of tw | o required) |
| Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply | /) | | Surface Soil C | racks (B6) | |
| ✓ Surface Water (A1) True Aquatic | Plants (B14) | - | Sparsely Vege | etated Concave Su | rface (B8) |
| High Water Table (A2) Hydrogen Su | lfide Odor (C1) | _ | ✓ Drainage Patte | erns (B10) | |
| Saturation (A3) Oxidized Rhi | zospheres on Living R | Roots (C3) | Moss Trim Lin | es (B16) | |
| Water Marks (B1) Presence of I | Reduced Iron (C4) | _ | Dry-Season W | /ater Table (C2) | |
| Sediment Deposits (B2) Recent Iron F | Reduction in Tilled Soi | ils (C6) _ | Crayfish Burro | ws (C8) | |
| Drift Deposits (B3) Thin Muck St | urface (C7) | - | Saturation Vis | ible on Aerial Imag | ery (C9) |
| Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Other (Explain | in in Remarks) | - | Stunted or Stre | essed Plants (D1) | |
| Iron Deposits (B5) | | _ | Geomorphic P | osition (D2) | |
| Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | | - | Shallow Aquita | ard (D3) his Delief (D4) | |
| Vater-Stained Leaves (B9) | | - | Microtopograp | | |
| | | | FAC-Neutral 1 | est (D5) | |
| Field Observations: | | | | | |
| Water Table Present? Yes Voc Depth (inche | es). <u>1</u> | | | | |
| Saturation Present? Yes <u>✓</u> No <u>Depth</u> (inche | es): <u>1"</u> | Wetland Hy | drology Present | ? Yes 🗸 | No |
| Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial pho | tos, previous inspecti | ions), if avai l a | ab le : | | |
| | | | | | |
| Remarks: | | | | | |
| Surface water observed within wetland area, | approximately | 20 feet f | from data po | oint. Water o | bserved |
| to fill soil pit to 12" | | | · | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

| Sampling Point | W1/DP-1 |
|----------------|---------|
| | |

| | Absoluto | Dominant | Indicator | Dominanco Tost workshoot: |
|--|----------|-------------|-----------|---|
| Tree Stratum (Plot size: 15 feet | % Cover | Species? | Status | Dominance rest worksheet. |
| A Acer negundo | 30 | YES | FACW | Number of Dominant Species |
| Celtis occidentalis | - 30 | VES | FACU | |
| | | | | Total Number of Dominant |
| 3 | | | | Species Across All Strata: (B) |
| 4 | | | | Percent of Dominant Species |
| 5 | | - | - | That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 80% (A/B) |
| 6 | | | - | , , |
| 7. | | - | - | Prevalence Index worksheet: |
| 8 | | _ | _ | Total % Cover of:Multiply by: |
| ··· | 60 | | | OBL species x 1 = |
| Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: ^{15 feet}) | | | | FACW species x 2 = |
| Acer negundo | 6 | YES | FAC | FAC species x 3 = |
| 10 | | - | - | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | OPL species |
| 4 | | - | | Column Totals: 0 (A) 0 (B) |
| 5 | | - | - | Drevelence index $= \mathbf{D}/\mathbf{A} = 0$ |
| 6 | | - | - | |
| 7. | | - | - | Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: |
| 8 | | _ | _ | 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation |
| 0 | | _ | _ | ✓ 2 - Dominance Test is >50% |
| 9 | | | | 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ |
| 10 | | | | 4 - Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting |
| Lierh Strature (Distaine), 15 feet | 0 | = Total Cov | rer | data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) |
| Persicaria hydroniperoides | 40 | VES | OBI | Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain) |
| | | | | |
| 2. Arundinana gigantea | | YES | FACW | ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must |
| 3. Carex frankii | 20 | NO | OBL | be present, unless disturbed or problematic. |
| 4 | | - | - | Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata |
| 5. | | - | - | Deminione er i eur vegetation etrata. |
| 6 | | - | - | Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or |
| 7 | | _ | _ | more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of |
| 7 | | | | neight. |
| 8 | | | | Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less |
| 9 | | | | than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall. |
| 10 | | - | | Herb – All berbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless |
| 11 | | - | - | of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall. |
| 12 | | - | - | |
| | 100 | = Total Cov | er | Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in |
| Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:) | | | | neight. |
| 1 | | - | - | |
| 2. | | - | - | |
| 3 | | _ | - | |
| ۰ | | _ | _ | |
| | | | | Hydrophytic |
| · 5 | | <u> </u> | | Vegetation |
| 6 | | | | Present? Yes Ves No |
| | 0 | = Total Cov | rer | |
| Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate | sheet.) | | | |
| | | | | |

| Profile Desc | cription: (Describe t | o the dep | oth needed to docur | nent the | indicator | or confirr | n the absence | of indicators.) |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Depth | Matrix | | Redo | x Feature | es | | | |
| (inches) | Color (moist) | % | Color (moist) | % | Type ¹ | Loc ² | Texture | Remarks |
| 0-1 | 10YR 3/3 | | | | | | | Organic material |
| 1-3 | 10YR 4/4 | _100 | | | | | silty clay | |
| 3-6 | 2.5Y 3/2 | 75 | 5YR 3/4 | 25 | D | PL | silty clay | |
| 6-10+ | 2.5Y 4/2 | 75 | 10YR 4/6 | 25 | D | PL | silty clay | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| ¹ Type: C=C | oncentration, D=Deple | etion, RM | Reduced Matrix, M | S=Maske | d Sand Gr | ains. | ² Location: PI | L=Pore Lining, M=Matrix. |
| Hydric Soil | Indicators: | | · | | | | Indic | ators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ : |
| Histosol | (A1) | | Dark Surface | e (S7) | | | 2 | 2 cm Muck (A10) (MLRA 147) |
| Histic Ep | pipedon (A2) | | Polyvalue Be | low Surfa | ace (S8) (N | /ILRA 147 | , 148) <u> </u> | Coast Prairie Redox (A16) |
| Black Hi | istic (A3) | | Thin Dark Sι | irface (SS |) (MLRA [·] | 147, 148) | | (MLRA 147, 148) |
| Hydroge | en Sulfide (A4) | | Loamy Gleye | ed Matrix | (F2) | | F | Piedmont Floodplain Soils (F19) |
| Stratified | d Layers (A5) | | ✓ Depleted Ma | trix (F3) | | | | (MLRA 136, 147) |
| 2 cm Mu | ıck (A10) (LRR N) | | Redox Dark | Surface (| F6) | | | |
| Deplete | d Below Dark Surface | (A11) | Depleted Da | rk Surfac | e (F7) | | \ | /ery Shallow Dark Surface (TF12) |
| Thick Da | ark Surface (A12) | | Redox Depre | essions (F | -8) | | C | Other (Explain in Remarks) |
| Sandy N | /lucky Mineral (S1) (L l | RR N, | Iron-Mangan | ese Mass | ses (F12) (| LRR N, | | |
| MLRA | A 147, 148) | | MLRA 13 | 6) | | | | |
| Sandy G | eyed Matrix (S4) | | Umbric Surfa | ice (F13) | (MLRA 13 | 86, 122) | ³ Inc | licators of hydrophytic vegetation and |
| Sandy F | Redox (S5) | | Piedmont Flor | odplain \$ | Soi l s (F19) | (MLRA 1 | 48) v | vetland hydrology must be present, |
| Stripped | l Matrix (S6) | | Red Parent | Material (I | =21) (MLR | A 127, 14 | - 7) u | nless disturbed or problematic. |
| Restrictive | Layer (if observed): | | | | | | | |
| Туре: | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Depth (in | ches): | | | | | | Hydric Soil | Present? Yes 🚩 No |
| Remarks: | | | | | | | | |

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Eastern Mountains and Piedmont

| Project/Site: Manufacturers Road Site | City/County: | Chattanooga / Hamilton | _ Sampling Date: <u>12/2/16</u> |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Applicant/Owner: | | State: TN | Sampling Point: <u>W1/DP-2</u> |
| Investigator(s): K. Smedley & B. Burnette of S&ME, Inc. | Section, Tow | nship, Range: | |
| Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): depression | _ Local relief (con | cave, convex, none): <u>concave</u> | Slope (%): <u>1%</u> |
| Subregion (LRR or MLRA): LRR Lat: 35.0613 | 70 | Long: -85.312005 | Datum: NAD83 |
| Soil Map Unit Name: Arents (ArB) and Enders-Urban land | complex (EhC) | NWI classi | fication: 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 signific | antly disturbed? | Are "Normal Circumstances' | ' present? Yes 🖌 No |
| Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology natural | lly prob l ematic? | (If needed, explain any answ | vers in Remarks.) |
| SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map show | ving sampling | point locations, transect | ts, important features, etc. |
| | | | |

| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present? | Yes Yes Yes | No No∕ No∕ | Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? | Yes | No | |
|---|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|----|--|
| Remarks: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

HYDROLOGY

| Wetland Hydrology Indicators: | Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required) |
|--|--|
| Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply) | Surface Soil Cracks (B6) |
| Surface Water (A1) True Aquatic Plants (B14) | Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) |
| High Water Table (A2) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) | Drainage Patterns (B10) |
| Saturation (A3) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living | Roots (C3) Moss Trim Lines (B16) |
| Water Marks (B1) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) | Dry-Season Water Table (C2) |
| Sediment Deposits (B2) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Se | oils (C6) Crayfish Burrows (C8) |
| Drift Deposits (B3) Thin Muck Surface (C7) | Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) |
| Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Other (Explain in Remarks) | Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) |
| Iron Deposits (B5) | Geomorphic Position (D2) |
| Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | Shallow Aquitard (D3) |
| Water-Stained Leaves (B9) | Microtopographic Relief (D4) |
| Aquatic Fauna (B13) | FAC-Neutral Test (D5) |
| Field Observations: | |
| Surface Water Present? Yes No <u>✓</u> Depth (inches): | |
| Water Table Present? Yes No 🗸 Depth (inches): | |
| | |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No stions), if available: |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspec | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Depth (inches): Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective) Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspec Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective) Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| Saturation Present? Yes No Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspective Remarks: Remarks: | Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

| | Absolute | Dominant | Indicator | Dominance Test worksheet: | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>15 feet</u>) | % Cover | Species? Status | | Number of Dominant Species | | | | |
| 1. <u>Acer negundo</u> | 60 | YES | FAC | That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A) | | | | |
| 2 | | - | - | Tatal Number of Densin ant | | | | |
| 3. | | - | - | Species Across All Strata: 5 (B) | | | | |
| 4 | | _ | _ | | | | | |
| 5 | | _ | _ | Percent of Dominant Species | | | | |
| S | | | | That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A/B) | | | | |
| 0 | | | | Prevalence Index worksheet: | | | | |
| / | | | | Total % Cover of: Multiply by: | | | | |
| 8 | | | | OBI species x 1 = | | | | |
| Sopling/Shrub Stratum (Plat aize: 15 feet | 60 | = Total Cover | | | | | | |
| <u>Saping/Shrub Stratum</u> (Plot size:) | 10 | YES | FACU | FAC aposion x 2 = | | | | |
| | | VES | | | | | | |
| | | 123 | | FACU species x 4 = | | | | |
| 3 | | | | UPL species x 5 = | | | | |
| 4 | | | | Column Totals: <u>0</u> (A) <u>0</u> (B) | | | | |
| 5 | | | | \mathbf{D} | | | | |
| 6 | | _ | - | | | | | |
| 7. | | - | - | Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: | | | | |
| 8 | | _ | - | 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation | | | | |
| 0. | | _ | _ | 2 - Dominance Test is >50% | | | | |
| 3 | | | | 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$ | | | | |
| 10 | 17 | | | 4 - Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting | | | | |
| o Stratum (Plot size: 15 feet) | | /er | data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) | | | | | |
| Arundinaria gigantea | 50 | YES | FACW | Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain) | | | | |
| o Smilax dauca | 30 | YES | FACU | | | | | |
| 2 | 15 | NO | FACIL | ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must | | | | |
| | 15 | | | be present, unless disturbed or problematic. | | | | |
| 4. Lonioera maadkii | | | | Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata: | | | | |
| 5 | | NU | | Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in (7.6 cm) or | | | | |
| 6 | | | | more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of height. | | | | |
| 7 | | | - | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | Senling/Shrub Woody plants evaluating vince loss | | | | |
| 9 | | | | than 3 in DBH and greater than 3 28 ft (1 m) tall | | | | |
| 10. | | - | - | | | | | |
| 11 | | - | - | Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless | | | | |
| 12 | | _ | _ | of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 π tall. | | | | |
| 12. | 115 | | | Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in | | | | |
| Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:) | ratum (Plot size:) | | | height. | | | | |
| 1 | | - | - | | | | | |
| 2 | | _ | _ | | | | | |
| 2 | | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | Hydrophytic | | | | |
| 5 | | | | Vegetation | | | | |
| 6 | | | | Present? Yes No _ | | | | |
| | 0 | = Total Cov | /er | | | | | |
| Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate | sheet.) | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Profile Desc | ription: (Describe | to the dept | h needed to docur | nent the ir | ndicator | or confirm | n the absence | of indicato | ors.) | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Depth | Matrix | | Redox Features | | | | | | | | |
| (inches) | Color (moist) | % | Color (moist) | % | Type ¹ | Loc ² | Texture | | Remarks | 6 | |
| 0-2 | 10YR 3/2 | 100 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2-7 | 10YR 4/3 | 100 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7-10+ | 10YR 4/4 | 100 | | · | | | | | | | |
| | | · | | · | | | | | | | |
| | | · | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Doduced Matrix M | | | | | | A M-Matrix | | |
| Hydric Soil | Indicators: | | Reduced Matrix, Ma | 5-IVIASKeu | Sand Gra | ams. | | ators for Pr | oblematic I | Ivdric Sc | oils ^{3.} |
| Histosol | (A1) | | Dark Surface | (87) | | | 2 | om Muck (/ | | 147) | |
| Histosof | (A1) | | | low Surfac | o (S8) /M | | 148) 2 | CITI MUCK (/ | Reday (A16 | 147) | |
| Black Hi | stic (A3) | | Thin Dark Su | iow Sunac | (MIRA 1 | 47 148) | 140) <u> </u> | | 7 148) |) | |
| Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | | | | Piedmont Floodplain Soils (F19) | | | | | | | |
| Stratified Lavers (A5) Depleted Matrix (F2) | | | | | (MI RA 136, 147) | | | | | | |
| 2 cm Mi | ick (A10) (I RR N) | | Bedox Dark S | Surface (Fi | 6) | | | (| •, • • • , | | |
| Depleted | d Below Dark Surface | e (A11) | Depleted Da | k Surface | (F7) | | V | erv Shallow | Dark Surfa | ce (TF12) | |
| Thick Dark Surface (A12) Redox Depressions (F8) | | | | | | · | ther (Explai | in in Remark | (s) | | |
| Sandv M | luckv Mineral (S1) (L | .RR N. | Iron-Mangan | ese Masse | , s (F12) (| LRR N. | | (| | / | |
| MLRA | A 147, 148) | , | MLRA 13 | 6) | - (* * - / (* | , | | | | | |
| Sandy G | eved Matrix (S4) | | Umbric Surfa | , ce (F13) (I | MLRA 13 | 6, 122) | ³ Ind | icators of hy | drophytic v | egetation | and |
| Sandy F | Redox (S5) | | Piedmont Flo | odplain Sc | oi l s (F19) | (MLRA 14 | (8) w | etland hydr | ology must l | be presen | t. |
| Stripped | Matrix (S6) | | Red Parent N | /laterial (F2 | 21) (MLR | A 127, 147 | 7) ur | nless disturk | bed or proble | ematic. | |
| Restrictive | Layer (if observed): | | | | | | | | | | |
| Type: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Depth (in | ches): | | | | | | Hydric Soil | Present? | Yes | No | ✓ |
| Remarks: | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |