Attachment 5

Orcutt Community Plan FEIR (95-EIR-01) Amendments

## Exhibit A:

Amended Map of Orcutt Significant Vegetation Map Amends OCP FEIR Figure 5.2-1, page 5.2-3



Revised June 12, 2012 October 10, 1997

## Exhibit B:

Amended Key Site 22 Map Amends OCP FEIR Figure KS22-3, page 22-6



## Exhibit C:

# OCP FEIR (95-EIR) Key Site #22 Text Amendments

#### *Exhibit C* OCP FEIR (95-EIR-1) Key Site #22 Text Amendments

EIR Section	Page Numbers	Actions
Chapter 5.2 Biology	Pgs: 5.2-1; 5.2-5; 5.2-19; and 5.2- 24.	Text revisions & deletions
Chapter 6 Alternatives	Pgs:6-11 and 6-27	Text deletions
Key Site #22	Pgs: 22-5; 22-9; 22-13, 22-14; 22- 19 and 22-24	Text revisions & deletions
Appendix D	All	Text deletion

#### **Removal of Wetlands Delineation References**<sup>1</sup>

G:\GROUP\COMP\Planning Areas\ORCUTT\Orcutt Community Plan\2011 Amendments\Public Hearings\BOS\\_12\_4\_12\_Hearing\5.Exhibit-C\_FEIR\_KS22\_Text\_Amendments.docx

## **5.2BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

#### METHODOLOGY

The information contained in this section has been collected primarily from field surveys conducted for this Community Plan EIR (Katherine Rindlaub Biological Consulting 1995a, Rindlaub 1994), field surveys by County staff in 1994 and 1995, and a preliminary wetland delineation on Key Site 22 (K. Rindlaub 1995b). Other sources include Smith 1976, Sweet 1992, Holland 1991, Olson 1991 and 1992, Collins 1991, Enviroplan 1990 and 1991 and ERC 1991. Information on the unique geological features found within and around the project area came from Hunt 1994. Information has also been gained from 1938 (Weislander) and 1980 (Santa Barbara County Conservation Element) vegetation maps, and aerial photographs taken in Fall 1989.

Field surveys were performed in 1995 by Katherine Rindlaub Biological Consulting in Spring 1995 on ten "Key Sites" within the Orcutt planning area. Surveys were conducted by the consultant team during April, May, and June of 1995. These were supplemented by County staff surveys in: May and December 1994 and April 1995. Surveys consisted of walking through each site. Features of particular biological importance, such as wetlands, potential breeding sites for sensitive vertebrates, and plant communities of special interest, were surveyed most intensively.

#### **5.2.1EXISTING CONDITIONS**

#### A.Physical Setting

The community of Orcutt is located in the southern portion of the Santa Maria Valley. It is bounded to the south by the Solomon Hills and to the west by the Casmalia Hills. The valley stretches northward, beyond Orcutt to the City of Santa Maria and the Santa Maria River. The valley also stretches east past US Highway 101, beyond the Planning Area boundary to the Santa Maria River at the base of the Sierra Madre Mountains. The Orcutt area is unusual biologically because of the broad valley floor covered by wind blown sand, deposited in dunes 6,000 to 80,000 years ago (Hunt 1994), surrounded by hills to the south and west, and exposure to hot, dry summers combined with prevailing winds from the northwest.

The aforementioned sand dunes are representative of one of the oldest, and last remaining wind blown dune systems in California, known as the Orcutt Terrace dune sheet. This massive sand dune sheet developed about the same time as Nipomo Mesa and Burton Mesa, and shares several of their unique plants and animals. Urban and agricultural development have eliminated many of the dunes and native habitat on the Nipomo and Burton Mesas. Similarly, much of the Orcutt Terrace dune sheet has experienced extensive urban and agricultural development, and none of the remaining dunes in Orcutt are protected.

Nevertheless, biological communities of regional significance remain in several undeveloped areas of the valley, along creek corridors, and in the Solomon and Casmalia Hills. The locations of plant communities within the Orcutt Planning Area are generally associated with differences in elevation, southern versus northern exposure to the sun, and proximity to water (both horizontal distance to stream courses, depth to groundwater, and the extent and duration of flooding. In general, wildlife occurs within specific plant communities. However, large and/or mobile wildlife will typically use several plant communities as their

<u>Wetlands</u>: The extent and quality of wetlands in California and the rest of the country have been dramatically reduced over the past century (National Audubon Society, 1992). Swamps and marshes have been drained, streams and rivers have been diverted and channelized, or used as convenient dumping grounds. Consequently, numerous plant and animal species that are dependent upon this habitat are threatened with extinction (See Table 5.2-1). Similarly, benefits derived from wetlands by humans such as water quality, aesthetics and duck hunting opportunities are also substantially reduced. Wetlands in the Santa Maria Valley probably once covered more than five thousand acres, supporting an exceptional diversity of water fowl and other wildlife. Total wetland acreage has likely been reduced to something less than a thousand acres (including the Santa Maria River mouth). Remnants of this system include the wetland/sand dune complex on Key Site 22, Wwhat remains of Betteravia Lakes and several isolated vernal ponds and pools in the City of Santa Maria, Sisquoc/Garey area, and north of Betteravia. *The Santa Barbara County Conservation Element describes vernal pools and freshwater marshes as being rare and/or endangered and recommends preservation of these habitats.* 

<u>Vernal Pools</u>: Vernal pools are shallow depressions in the soil that are temporarily filled with water from winter rains and subsequently dry up during the spring and early summer. These pools are underlain by an impervious layer that slows or prevents water drainage. Vernal pools are perhaps the most unique, rare, and endangered type of wetland in California (California Department of Fish and Game 1995). They are unique because they are vegetated by herbaceous plants that are adapted to survive the beginning of their lives completely covered by water and later to survive and flower in a completely dry environment. The Orcutt pools are particularly uncommon and have unique characteristics because they occur on sand with a very shallow hardpan.

Many of the Orcutt pools are deeply flooded and persist into early summer particularly in wet years. Species composition may vary from year to year depending on the depth and duration of flooding, and some of the pools may join in wet years and remain separate in drier years. The vernal pools in the Orcutt area range from deep basins with many species of hydrophytic (water loving) plants to long shallow grooves dominated by just one or two species of wetland plants (Olson 1991). While some vernal pools remain isolated, other pools may form complexes, joining across low-lying grassland areas (vernal flats) in wet years but remain isolated in drier years. "Vernal flats" (Ferren, 1988) is used to describe wetlands that occur in shallow basins that are not deep enough to be discernable pools. In wetter years, vernal pool and other wetland species dominate these low areas. During dry years, upland grasses and other herbs may dominate (Olson, 1992). In wet years in particular, they are an important component of the the flats wetland/grassland complex as they often provide the transition or migration zone between flooded and upland areas. The only place that vernal wetlands occur in the Orcutt Planning Area is on the northern portion of Key Site 22. This complex continues offsite to the east and northeast on the airport property (Figure 3 in EIR Volume II, Key Site 22).

Dominants in the Orcutt area include numerous native species such as water starwort and wooly heads. Several amphibians in the Orcutt area are completely dependent upon these vernal pools for their survival. The California tiger salamander and western spadefoot toad (both candidates for the Federal Endangered Species List and listed as California Species of Special Concern) depend soley on these pools to breed in and develop in their larval stage. Other more widespread amphibian species (e.g. western toad, Pacific chorus frog) also use vernal pools for breeding, and garter snakes, in turn, feed on tadpoles and larval salamanders and are consequently attracted to vernal pools. A remarkable diversity of shorebirds and **Impact BIO-32: Removal of eucalyptus woodlands.** Removal of eucalyptus woodlands that are used as a roosting and/or nesting site for raptors could have a *potentially significant* impact on raptor populations, many of whom are California Species of Special Concern.

**Impact BIO-33: Weed invasion.** Landscaping with weedy species in the proposed newly urbanized areas could have a *potentially significant* impact on the remaining acreages of native plant communities by displacing native species and thus significantly altering habitat characteristics and ecological functions. These weedy species include iceplant, pampas grass, veldt grass, eucalyptus, spiny clotbur and Australian fireweed.

#### **Policy Impacts**

Adoption of the Orcutt Community Plan may include adoption of numerous policies affecting future development. Those policies that have the potential of <u>significantly impacting</u> biological resources are discussed below. The following analysis is based upon the draft policies contained within the November 15, 1994 Initiation Draft Orcutt Community Plan.

**Impact BIO-34: Parks, Recreation and Schools policies.** Draft policies 1, 3, 5 and 8 encourage or direct the County to increase recreational opportunities on open land, including encouraging private development to incorporate facilities such as golf courses. In particular, Draft PRT policy 8, and Schools policies 1 and 5 could result in elimination of a substantial portion of the vernal wetland/sand dune complex (next to Arrellanes School). and other wetlands on Key Site 22. This could result in the elimination of critical habitat areas and is *potentially significant*.

**Impact BIO-35: Trails policies.** Draft policies 22, 23 and 24 encourage the County to develop a comprehensive trail system on open lands. This could result in elimination of sensitive plants, as discussed in Impact BIO-8 which is *potentially significant*.

**Impact BIO-36:** Sewer system policies. Draft policies 1 and 2 could result in *potentially significant* impacts to creeks and wetlands as described in Impacts BIO-10, 11, and 12.

**Impact BIO-37: Transportation policies.** Draft policy 1 requires completion of needed roadways which would have *potentially significant* impacts as described in Impacts BIO-1 - 7.

**Impact BIO-38: Flood Control policies.** Draft Policies 6 and 12 requiring retention basins would have *potentially significant* impacts to riparian and other systems (Impact BIO-15).

#### **C.Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts from development of the Orcutt Community Plan in addition to development in the City of Santa Maria, Vandenberg Air Force Base and southwestern San Luis Obispo County would be most severely **cumulatively significant** to wetlands, riparian, central dune scrub, oak woodlands, central coast scrub and sandhill chaparral communities. In particular, development of portions of the proposed golf course and Union Valley Parkway extension on the southern portions of the airport property would

**Mitigation BIO-22:** The ancient sand dunes of Orcutt shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. All feasible measures shall be taken to avoid impacts to these dunes, including but not limited to: realignment of roads and construction of bridges over rather than through dunes. (*Addresses Impact BIO-24*).

**Mitigation BIO-23:** Sandhill chaparral, central dune scrub, oak woodlands and central coastal sage scrub shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. Developments adjacent to these areas shall employ setbacks, clustering, native landscape buffers and restoration of degraded areas including any impacted rare species. The goal of the plans shall be to have no net loss of habitat. (*Addresses Impacts BIO-25, -26, -27, and -29*)

**Mitigation BIO-24:** Riparian vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. A minimum buffer of 50 feet from the dripline of riparian vegetation shall be maintained. All new development adjacent to creeks and streams shall be required to implement a riparian habitat restoration plan. The project shall minimize the effects of adjacent urbanization by: 1) locating the restoration onsite to the maximum extent feasible, 2) hooding and directing all lights away from the creek, 3) providing a long-term drainage plan that directs any potentially polluted drainage away from the creek, and 4) implementing an erosion and sedimentation control plan during construction. (*Addresses Impact BIO-28*)

**Mitigation BIO-25:** No recreational or other development shall be permitted that would adversely impact the Bishop Pine Forest. In order to preserve the potential for wildfire and regeneration to occur, any new structures shall be located a minimum of 300 feet from the forest boundary. (*Addresses Impact BIO-30*)

**Mitigation BIO-26:** Oak trees shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. Measures taken to preserve oak trees should include modification of project design (eg: clustering, narrower road width, taller building heights, etc). The area protected from grading, paving and other disturbances should include the area 6 feet outside of the dripline. Where oak trees are killed, they shall be replaced in a manner consistent with County standards. (*Addresses Impact BIO-31*)

**Mitigation BIO-27:** Eucalyptus woodlands that are used as roosting and/or nesting site for raptors shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. Where eucalyptus trees are removed, they should be replaced by native trees. (*Addresses Impact BIO-32*)

**Mitigation BIO-28:** Landscape plans for developments on the edge of open space areas shall include trees and shrubs native to the Santa Maria Valley. (The Orcutt Biological Resources Technical Report [Rindlaub 1995a] contains a list of species.) Planting of invasive weedy plants such as iceplant, pampas grass, veldt grass, monterey pine, eucalyptus, spiny clotbur and Australian fireweed shall be strongly discouraged and removed where feasible in these areas. (*Addresses Impact BIO-33*)

*Vastewater Treatment:* Adequate sewer capacity is a significant issue for the community both under the existing and proposed plans. The current RWQCB moratorium for Laguna County Sanitation District would remain in effect. Even if the existing wastewater treatment plant were allowed to operate at full capacity, the plant would not have sufficient remaining capacity to accommodate the wastewater demands of buildout of the existing plan. A supplemental wastewater treatment plant will likely have to be constructed or the existing plant torn down and replaced.

**Retention Basin System:** Buildout under the existing plan would contribute additional run-off from future development within the Orcutt Creek watershed. The current system of conditioning individual subdivisions to construct smaller on-site retention basins to gather and control run-off would continue under the existing plan.

*Schools:* Due to the significant increase in student enrollment since 1980, Orcutt area school districts have identified a need for three additional elementary schools, one junior high and one high school to serve buildout of the existing plan. However, no new potential school sites are identified in the 1980 plan.

#### 6.2 IMPACT ANALYSIS

#### ALTERNATIVE 1: "NO PROJECT"

A. Land Use: Impacts associated with land use patterns of development would be less under the No Project alternative since future development would primarily be associated with urban in-fill and limited evelopment in the Solomon foothills and west Orcutt. Density reductions on Key Sites 22 and 33 would minimize infrastructure, air quality, and traffic impacts associated with "leap frog" development. In addition, growth inducing impacts associated with the precedent setting action of extending the Urban/Rural Boundary line and urban services west to Black Road and east of Hwy 101 would be avoided under the existing plan. Nevertheless, some urban development could occur on rural land. Thus, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable (Class I)/

However, since many parcels would retain their antiquated County Ordinance 661 zoning designations, minimum parcel sizes would remain unresolved for portions of the Orcutt planning area under the "no project" alternative.

In addition, the proposed Oil Activity Overlay, Open Space Overlay, and Transfer of Development Credits program "planning tools" would not be available to address specific land use concerns associated with buildout of the existing plan.

**B.** *Biological Resources:* Overall impacts to biological resources would be substantially less severe than the proposed project primarily due to density reductions on Key Sites 3, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 30, 33, and 35, but also due to existing development restrictions on Site 12. Potential impacts would also be significantly reduced to rare and unique habitats such as ancient sand dunes on Key Sites 22 and 30, and extensive vernal pools and associated wetlands on Key Site 22. Reduced development would have fewer impacts to oak woodlands, grasslands, sand hill chaparral, central coast sage scrub, and riparian forest and woodland communities. However habitat elimination and fragmentation would still result in *significant navoidable* impacts (Class I).

3. Biological Resources: Impacts to biological resources would be substantially less than the proposed project primarily due to density reductions on Key Sites 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 22, 33, and 35. Potential impacts would also be significantly reduced to rare and unique habitats such as ancient sand dunes on Key Site 22; and extensive vernal pools and associated wetlands on Key Site 22. Reduced development would have fewer impacts to oak woodlands, grasslands, sand hill chaparral, central coast sage scrub, and riparian forest and woodland communities, however habitat elimination and fragmentation would still result in <u>significant</u> <u>unavoidable impacts (Class I)</u>.

Impacts associated with public infrastructure improvements would be reduced by the absence of the extension of Stubblefield Road/Stillwell Road and "E" Street extensions of the proposed plan. Remaining public infrastructure improvements have the potential to result in impacts to biological resources. Significant impacts to resources would remain in the Orcutt Creek and southern foothill areas. Overall, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

C. Agricultural Resources: Agricultural impacts would be substantially reduced by reduction in buildout on Keysites 12, 22, and 33 from the 1,992 units of the project to 25 dwellings on forty acre parcels. Current agricultural production acreages for these sites include: approximately 60 acres of cultivated agriculture on Key Site 12, approximately 480 acres of cultivated and 300+ acres of grazing land on Key Site 22, and approximately 260 acres of grazing land on Key Site 33. Keys Sites 22 and 33 would retain their rural agricultural designations, while potential development on Key Site 12 would occur on grasslands which have not been grazed in recent history. Impacts to agriculture from the low-growth alternative would be <u>less than significant (Class II)</u>.

**D.** *Geology:* Geologic impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project, with the exception that reduced buildout in the foothills and along Orcutt Creek, would have corresponding reductions in erosion hazards (i.e., blowing sand, erosion, collapsible soils, etc.) related to buildout on steep slopes in the foothills and along Orcutt and Pine Canyon Creeks. Under the low-growth scenario, few Key Sites have standard single family lot zone designations (e.g. 1-E-1, 20-R-1, etc.) requiring minimum lot sizes and setbacks. However, since extensive development would still occur within the foothill and Orcutt Creek canyon areas, overall impacts from exposure of new development to geologic hazards would remain *less than significant* (Class II) with development created increased in erosion remaining *unavoidable and significant* (Class I).

E. *Flooding\Drainage:* Flooding and drainage impacts would be slightly less than those identified for the proposed project primarily due to reduced development potential, and consequently reduced storm water run-off, for Key Sites located along Orcutt Creek (Key Site 7, 8, 22) and Pine Canyon Creek (Key Sites 12, 15). Run off from development of these sites could result in increased erosion and sedimentation of local creeks. The low-growth alternative could be served by a regional retention basin system (See discussion above). Under the low-growth scenario, few Key Sites would have standard single family lot zone designations (e.g. 1-E-1, 20-R-1, etc.) requiring minimum lot sizes and setbacks. Overall, impacts would remain *less than significant* (Class II).

**F.** *Water Resources:* Impacts on groundwater resources would be reduced corresponding to the decrease in residential development from the project (Table 6-7). Nonetheless, residential, commercial-industrial, municipal and agricultural growth within the OPA permitted under the low-growth alternative would create stentially significant impacts to groundwater resources due to the contribution to ongoing and increased

overdraft of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin by generating an increase in net water demand of 1,890 AFY

Approximately 481 acres are under cultivation or developed with agricultural industry support facilities. A large portion of the remaining 700 acres are used as grazing land, and several areas support significant ecological communities. In the southern portion of the site, the Orcutt Creek stream channel and corresponding flood plain, ranging from 500 to 1,000 feet in width, traverses the site from east to west, generally parallel to Highway 1. Scattered riparian and/or wetland vegetation is located along this flood plain. A vernal-wetland/grassland complex occupies approximately 120 acres north of Dutard Road, and contains-is the largest known vernal pool\_complex-in the County. These areas support a wide variety of wildlife including tiger salamanders, Pacific chorus frogs, and larvae of the western spadefoot toad. The vernal-wetland/grassland/dune areas also serve as prime foraging habitat for many bird species, including several shorebirds and ducks.

Sandhill chapparal, dominated by multi-trunked coast live oak, mock heather, and coyote brush, with scattered Purisima manzanita, occupies a 33 acre stabilized dune area along the central eastern boundary, adjacent to the Santa Maria Public Airport. Ponded water accumulates in depressions between the dunes during wet years, and support species such as the western pond turtle (a candidate for the endangered species list). A thin strip of central dune scrub separates these areas from cultivated fields to the south. The Orcutt Creek channel becomes wide and flat throughout the central portion of the site, and supports rush, bulrush and several freshwater marshOrcutt Creek areas. Freshwater marshOrcutt Creek is also present at three locations along the western site boundary. The remainder of the areas not in active cultivation are covered by large tracts of annual grassland, which constitute prime foraging habitat for a number of bird species including the golden eagle. Figure KS22-3 shows the locations of the site's biological resources.

Two roads provide access to the site. The old road bed of Dutard Road enters the northern portion of the site from Black Road, approximately 1,100 ft from the northern site boundary. This unimproved asphalt and dirt road provides access to a residence and agricultural fields, and extends to the eastern site boundary. Another dirt road enters the southeast corner of the site from Solomon Road, and extends along the eastern site boundary.

#### A.4Project Description

The existing Urban/Rural Boundary Line would be extended to incorporate approximately an additional 800 acres of the site which currently lie outside of it (Figure KS22-2). The proposed designations for the site would be Planned Development (Max. 2,000 units)/PRD. This designation would allow for the construction of up to 2,000 residential units of various densities, and a community center. Development could also include a supporting commercial facilities. It is also likely that two 10 acre elementary school sites and a 17 acre junior high school site would be located on Key Site 22, to serve residents of west Orcutt at this level of development. As referenced in the main project description, the Planned Residential Development zoning district identifies a 40% minimum open space requirement, which would total a minimum of 471.8 acres for this site (40% of 1179.45 acres). This zoning allows for clustering of units so that hazardous and sensitive areas may be avoided, adequate public services are provided, and open space is preserved. The floodplain of Orcutt creek, Canyons of the drainages near Black Road, and the sensitive biological resources on the northern portions of the property and the northeastern corner generally meet the criteria for open space as outlined in the PRD zoning district. Therefore, in order to be consistent with the purpose and intent of this zone district, it is likely that development on the site would be clustered within 743 acres of the site, located mainly within areas currently used for grazing or agricultural production. Figure KS22-4 shows the likely developable areas on the site.

**Resources:** The potential Open Space Overlay would protect the Site's most sensitive biological resources including to wetland floodplain areas of Orcutt Creek, a 30+ acre ancient sand dune area with specimen oaks and about 120 acres of Vernal Pool-grassland complex. This area would also accommodate a trail and provide a buffer between the City and the unincorporated areas. several historic and/ or archaeological sites would also be covered by the overlay.

Figure KS22-4 shows the areas to which the Open Space Overlay would be applied. This configuration would approximate the open space areas shown in a previous conceptual site plan endorsed by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

<u>Potential Buildout Characteristics</u>: The proposed designations would allow for a diversity of housing types to be constructed on the site. Proposed densities range from 1 unit/acre to 6 units/acre, and a preliminary plan identifies areas for each unit density (Figure KS22-4). In general, the lowest densities would be located along the Highway 1 corridor, the highest would be located near the intersection of Union Valley Parkway and "E" Street, and moderate density development would be located throughout the remainder of the proposed developable area.

Under this development scenario, the existing alignment of Dutard Road would be abandoned, and the roadway would be realigned to the south. The new alignment would provide through access between Black Road and "E" Street. Under the City of Santa Maria's Circulation Element, "E" Street would be a north-south arterial roadway along the site's western-most north/south boundary with the Santa Maria Airport, and would terminate at the proposed extension of Union Valley Parkway (Figure KS22-5). However, this proposed alignment has significant biological impacts which are discussed in further detail in Section 5.2 (Volume I) and Section B.1 in the Key Site 22 analysis (Volume II). Union Valley Parkway is proposed to extend from the center of the site's eastern-most boundary to Highway 1. The eventual alignment of the "E" Street and Dutard Road corridors may be affected by open space planning and the protection of biological resources. Figure KS22-5.1 shows Planning and Development's recommended alignment of Dutard Road and "E" Street through Key Site #22. Figure KS22-5.2 depicts feasible access points from Highway 1, Black Road and UVP.

<u>Potential Commercial Center:</u> A 15 acre neighborhood commercial center could be constructed at the northeast corner of the "E" Street/UVP to serve development on the site. The PRD zoning district allows for 2 acres of supporting commercial facilities on a PRD "site". However, Key Site 22 is comprised of 15 parcels ranging from 4.6 acres to 234.39 acres in size. Seven of the parcels exceed 100 acres in size and could each have at least 2 acres of supporting commercial facilities if they were developed individually. This center has not been assessed in standard impact analysis for this site; however, the center's impacts have been assessed in Alternative 2 (High Buildout).

## **B.ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

The sections which follow do not include discussions of impacts to the following areas: Police Protection, Natural Gas, Electricity, and Library Services. Either no significant impacts to these resources(eg electricity, natural gas) were identified during initial evaluation of the proposed project, or these issues are adequately addressed in the regional impact analysis in Volume 1 (eg library/ police service). Significant impacts are anticipated for several other issue areas and are described in detail below.

#### **B.1Biological Resources**

#### <u>Setting</u>

Of the 1179.45 acres on this site, approximately 481 acres are either under cultivation or are developed with agricultural industry support facilities. A large portion of the remaining 700 acres are used as grazing land, and several areas support significant ecological communities. The following biological information was obtained from a botanical survey by Holland between April 25 and June 26 1991, a botanical survey of the vernal pool complexarea by Olson on May 21 and May 26 1991, a brief cursory survey by Rindlaub on May 13 and 15 1994, and an intensive survey in April and May 1995 by Rindlaub, Storrer and Hunt, and wetland delineations by Rindlaub and Storrer, 1995.

Key Site 22 contains a wide variety of biological resources. The Site's location in a rural area surrounded on three sides by extensive tracts of lightly developed or undeveloped land provides relatively accessible linkages from the site to larger habitat areas. In the southern portion of the site, the Orcutt Creek stream channel and corresponding flood plain, ranging from 500 to 1,000 feet in width, traverses the site from east to west, generally parallel to Highway 1. Scattered riparian and/or wetland vegetation is located along this 126 acre flood plain. A wetland delineation performed in Spring 1995 identified 110.34 acres of wetlands in the floodplain (Rindlaub, 1995). The creek corridor provides both important habitat itself and linkages both upstream and downstream to relatively undisturbed areas for wildlife movement and the dispersal of plants.

A vernal wetland/grassland complex occupies approximately 120 acres north of Dutard Road. This habitat extends eastward onto the Santa Maria Public Airport. This area contains the largest known vernal pool complex in the County and consist of a complex of sandy uplands with annual grasslands, with 41 acres of vernal ponds, vernal pools, vernal flats, and freshwater marsh swales (Rindlaub, 1995). The 80 acres of upland habitat that surround the vernal pools and other wetlands are critical habitat for the spadefoot toad and tiger salamander that live in burrows within the grasslands during the dry months of the year. Towards the northeast corner of the site, this complex becomes interlaced with a wetland/dune complex, which continues to the east onto airport property. A portion of the complex also extends south of Dutard Road, but portions of this area have been degraded by grading and agricultural activity. Pools and marshes form in low lying areas and depressions due to the hardpan variant of Narlon Soils which is prevalent throughout these areas. The mashes and pools in the low lying areas and the grasslands and scrub habitats in the uplands exhibit significant ecological interaction. For example, some of the species which depend upon the pools for breeding during the winter and spring migrate or "retreat" into the adjacent upland grassland and dune areas during the summer, fall and early winter. This is particularly true of several amphibian species, such as the spadefoot toad and tiger salamander. These species were formerly wide spread within the Santa Maria Valley, but now are both candidates for listing for protection under the federal Endangered Species Act.

In addition to these federal candidate species, this complex supports a wide variety of other types of wildlife. Pacific chorus frogs were observed in the vernal pools during a site visit. These areas also serve as prime foraging habitat for many bird species, including a wide variety of shorebirds and ducks. Shorebird species observed in these areas include the western grebe, long billed dowitcher, great egret, green heron, black-necked stilt, etc. Ducks observed include the northern pintail, cinnamon teal and American widgeon. Small mammals inhabit the upland areas and increase their value as foraging grounds for raptors. A golden eagle was observed diving on prey during a site visit by County staff in April 1995.

Sandhill chaparral, dominated by multi-trunked coast live oak, mock heather, and coyote brush, with scattered individuals of the rare Purisima manzanita, occupies a 33 acre stabilized dune area along the central eastern boundary, adjacent to the Santa Maria Public Airport. Ponded water accumulates in depressions between the dunes during wet years, and support species such as the western pond turtle (a candidate for the endangered species list). A thin strip of central dune scrub separates these areas from cultivated fields to the south.

Eucalyptus windrows occur on the eastern site boundary, and on portions of the western parcel boundary of 111-240-30. The eastern windrow also contains several Monterrey cypress trees. These windrows serve as roosting areas for raptors which forage in the site's grasslands.

The Orcutt creek channel becomes wide and flat throughout the center of the segment which crosses this site. This has resulted in significant sedimentation, and the formation of a unique inland delta area, with the main channel diverging into several small stream channels. A freshwater marsh<u>E</u>-mergent vegetation such as rush and bulrush has developed along these segments of the creek, and supports emergent vegetation such as rush and bulrush, which provide excellent nesting habitat for red-winged and Brewer's blackbirds. Freshwater marsh is also present at 3 locations along the western site boundary, where dDrainages are impounded at 3 locations along the western site boundary by the berm which supports Black Road.

The remainder of the areas not in active cultivation are covered by large tracts of annual grassland, which constitute prime foraging habitat for a number of bird species including: white tailed kite, red-tailed hawk, golden eagle and loggerhead shrike. The terrain and its associated vegetation comprise prime habitat for the burrowing owl, a species which has declined dramatically in Santa Barbara County. Black-tailed jackrabbit and ground squirrels are also common in these areas. Overall, the 1179 acre Site's variety of habitats, undeveloped character and location in a rural area provide varied habitats for a wide variety of wildlife. Larger mammals using the site are expected to include grey fox, coyote, deer and possibly bobcat and badger.

#### Impacts

Development of this site with 2,000 or more units would substantially alter existing habitat values not only by direct removal of substantial amounts of habitat, but by fragmentation of remaining habitats and the introduction of substantial disturbances from new human populations including noise, light, polluted run-off and domestic animals. In addition to the County's proposed realignment of Dutard Road and "E" Street, as depicted in Figure KS22-5.1, Figure KS22-6 depicts the potential realignment of "E" Street via Dutard Road and Black Road. This alternative would completely avoid the sensitive vernal pool/wetland sand dune complex, however it may not satisfy north/south circulation needs.

**Impact BIO-32: Removal of eucalyptus woodlands.** Removal of eucalyptus woodlands that are used as a roosting and/or nesting site for raptors could have a *potentially significant* impact on raptor populations, many of whom are California Species of Special Concern.

**Impact BIO-33: Weed invasion.** Landscaping with weedy species in the proposed newly urbanized areas could have a *potentially significant* impact on the remaining acreages of native plant communities by displacing native species and thus significantly altering habitat characteristics and ecological functions. These weedy species include iceplant, pampas grass, veldt grass, eucalyptus, spiny clotbur and Australian fireweed.

#### **Policy Impacts**

Adoption of the Orcutt Community Plan may include adoption of numerous policies affecting future development. Those policies that have the potential of <u>significantly impacting</u> biological resources are discussed below. The following analysis is based upon the draft policies contained within the November 15, 1994 Initiation Draft Orcutt Community Plan.

**Impact BIO-34: Parks, Recreation and Schools policies.** Draft policies 1, 3, 5 and 8 encourage or direct the County to increase recreational opportunities on open land, including encouraging private development to incorporate facilities such as golf courses. In particular, Draft PRT policy 8, and Schools policies 1 and 5 could result in elimination of a substantial portion of the vernal wetland/sand dune complex (next to Arrellanes School). and other wetlands on Key Site 22. This could result in the elimination of critical habitat areas and is *potentially significant*.

**Impact BIO-35: Trails policies.** Draft policies 22, 23 and 24 encourage the County to develop a comprehensive trail system on open lands. This could result in elimination of sensitive plants, as discussed in Impact BIO-8 which is *potentially significant*.

**Impact BIO-36:** Sewer system policies. Draft policies 1 and 2 could result in *potentially significant* impacts to creeks and wetlands as described in Impacts BIO-10, 11, and 12.

**Impact BIO-37: Transportation policies.** Draft policy 1 requires completion of needed roadways which would have *potentially significant* impacts as described in Impacts BIO-1 - 7.

**Impact BIO-38: Flood Control policies.** Draft Policies 6 and 12 requiring retention basins would have *potentially significant* impacts to riparian and other systems (Impact BIO-15).

#### **C.Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts from development of the Orcutt Community Plan in addition to development in the City of Santa Maria, Vandenberg Air Force Base and southwestern San Luis Obispo County would be most severely **cumulatively significant** to wetlands, riparian, central dune scrub, oak woodlands, central coast scrub and sandhill chaparral communities. In particular, development of portions of the proposed golf course and Union Valley Parkway extension on the southern portions of the airport property would

**Mitigation BIO-22:** The ancient sand dunes of Orcutt shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. All feasible measures shall be taken to avoid impacts to these dunes, including but not limited to: realignment of roads and construction of bridges over rather than through dunes. (*Addresses Impact BIO-24*).

**Mitigation BIO-23:** Sandhill chaparral, central dune scrub, oak woodlands and central coastal sage scrub shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. Developments adjacent to these areas shall employ setbacks, clustering, native landscape buffers and restoration of degraded areas including any impacted rare species. The goal of the plans shall be to have no net loss of habitat. (*Addresses Impacts BIO-25, -26, -27, and -29*)

**Mitigation BIO-24:** Riparian vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. A minimum buffer of 50 feet from the dripline of riparian vegetation shall be maintained. All new development adjacent to creeks and streams shall be required to implement a riparian habitat restoration plan. The project shall minimize the effects of adjacent urbanization by: 1) locating the restoration onsite to the maximum extent feasible, 2) hooding and directing all lights away from the creek, 3) providing a long-term drainage plan that directs any potentially polluted drainage away from the creek, and 4) implementing an erosion and sedimentation control plan during construction. (*Addresses Impact BIO-28*)

**Mitigation BIO-25:** No recreational or other development shall be permitted that would adversely impact the Bishop Pine Forest. In order to preserve the potential for wildfire and regeneration to occur, any new structures shall be located a minimum of 300 feet from the forest boundary. (*Addresses Impact BIO-30*)

**Mitigation BIO-26:** Oak trees shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. Measures taken to preserve oak trees should include modification of project design (eg: clustering, narrower road width, taller building heights, etc). The area protected from grading, paving and other disturbances should include the area 6 feet outside of the dripline. Where oak trees are killed, they shall be replaced in a manner consistent with County standards. (*Addresses Impact BIO-31*)

**Mitigation BIO-27:** Eucalyptus woodlands that are used as roosting and/or nesting site for raptors shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. Where eucalyptus trees are removed, they should be replaced by native trees. (*Addresses Impact BIO-32*)

**Mitigation BIO-28:** Landscape plans for developments on the edge of open space areas shall include trees and shrubs native to the Santa Maria Valley. (The Orcutt Biological Resources Technical Report [Rindlaub 1995a] contains a list of species.) Planting of invasive weedy plants such as iceplant, pampas grass, veldt grass, monterey pine, eucalyptus, spiny clotbur and Australian fireweed shall be strongly discouraged and removed where feasible in these areas. (*Addresses Impact BIO-33*)

### Exhibit C.1

*To be removed from* OCP FEIR Appendix D: Vernal Wetlands and Orcutt Creek Wetlands Delineation, K. Rindlaub Biological Consulting, September 1, 1995.

Document available in *Attachment 6: Planning Commission Action Letter* and for viewing and download at: http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/orcutt/orcutt.php)

#### REPLACEMENT PAGE

#### APPENDIX D

Vernal Wetlands and Orcutt Creek Wetlands Delineation, K. Rindlaub Biological Consulting, September 1, 1995 removed by Resolution # \_\_\_\_\_\_ of the Board of Supervisors in compliance with court ruling in Adam Bros. Farming Inc. v. County of Santa Barbara (Super Ct. Santa Barbara County, 2004, No. 1007452)

#### WEST ORCUTT PLANNING AREA 8

## VERNAL WETLANDS AND ORCUTT CREEK

## WETLAND DELINEATION



Prepared for:

Planning and Development Department County of Santa Barbara 123 East Anapamu Street Santa Barbara, California 93101

Prepared by: Katherine Rindlaub Biological Consulting P.O. Box 31111 Santa Barbara, California 93130

September 1, 1995

### WEST ORCUTT PLANNING AREA 8

## VERNAL WETLANDS AND ORCUTT CREEK

### WETLAND DELINEATION

Prepared for:

Planning and Development Department County of Santa Barbara 123 East Anapamu Street Santa Barbara, California 93101

Prepared by: Katherine Rindlaub Biological Consulting P.O. Box 31111 Santa Barbara, California 93130

September 1, 1995

## WEST ORCUTT PLANNING AREA 8 VERNAL WETLANDS AND ORCUTT CREEK

#### WETLAND DELINEATION

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Introduction	1
Environmental Setting	1
Regional Setting	1
Geology	2
Soils	2
Orcutt Creek Wetland Delineation	6
Site Description	6
Methods	6
Results	8
Discussion	16
Delineation of Vernal Wetlands North of or Bisected by	
and Unpaved Agricultural Access Road	19
Site Description	19
Methods	19
Results	21
Discussion	21
Summary	24
References	27

i

## TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED

## List of Tables

Title	Page
Table 1 Soil Units Mapped by the USDA Soil Conservation   Service in the Study Area	
Table 2 Orcutt Creek Jurisdictional Wetlands	3
Table 3 Vernal Pools and Vernal Wetlands Complexes	22

## List of Figures

Title	Fol	lows Page
Figure 1	Vicinity Map	2
Figure 2	Vernal Wetland Area Soil Types	2
Figure 3	Orcutt Creek Soil Types	6
Figure 4	Orcutt Creek Floodplain	8
Figure 5	Orcutt Creek Wetlands	10
Figure 6	Vernal Pond	20
Figure 7	Vernal Wetlands	22

#### **Introduction**

The area in and around the City of Orcutt, in northern Santa Barbara County, is experiencing rapid growth. Consequently, the Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department identified a number of parcels likely to be proposed for development in the near future. Among these parcels, or clusters of parcels, are several that are known to have significant biological resources. Area 8 (Key Site 22) is a 693 acre group of parcels located in the sparsely developed West Orcutt Planning Area. A number of wetlands are included within Area 8. Among these wetlands are two large areas of particular concern: Orcutt Creek, its tributaries and floodplain, and a complex of vernal wetlands and sand dunes. The purpose of this report is to delineate the extent of wetlands on these two sections of Area 8.

Area 8 is located northeast of the intersection of State Highway 1 and Black Road, west of the City of Orcutt, and southwest of the Santa Maria Airport. The southern end is traversed by Orcutt Creek. A series of deep swales with freshwater marsh wetlands extends to the northwest along the western boundary. The northern section, north of an unpaved agricultural access road, supports a complex of vernal pools, vernal ponds, vernal flats and vernal marsh, which continues off the site onto the Santa Maria Airport property. A minor drainage crosses the site from east to west about one-third of the distance south of the northern boundary. The central section of the site is under cultivation.

Two different procedures were used to delineate wetlands on two areas of this site. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers method was used for Orcutt Creek and its tributaries, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife method was used for the vernal wetlands area. Because of these differences in methodology, and the different character of the wetlands classified, the two areas are presented separately.

#### **Environmental Setting**

#### **Regional Setting**

The Orcutt Planning Area, including the City of Orcutt, lies along the southern side of the Santa Maria Valley in northwestern Santa Barbara County, California (Figure 1). The valley is bordered on the south by the Solomon and Casmalia Hills. Regional climate is Mediterranean, with warm, dry summers and cool, wet winters. Average annual rainfall is 12 to 18 inches, with precipitation

generally restricted to winter and early spring. Summer temperatures are ameliorated by a marine layer of fog and low clouds that frequently penetrates into the project area from the Pacific Ocean to the west. The average annual air temperature is 57°F. Prevailing winds are from the northwest.

#### Geology

The soils and topography of the Santa Maria Valley are unusual in California. This is one of six localized and disjunct regions where a subsiding basin permitted successive events of aeolian sand deposition. Following periods of marine deposition (middle Miocene to late Pliocene), tectonic rotation and uplift, the basin was formed. This basin was bordered by southwest/northeast trending hills. Non-marine, fluvial materials were deposited in the basin from the early to late Pleistocene. From the Pleistocene onward, periods of uplift and subsidence, with changes in eustatic sea level, created conditions for deposition of wind-blown sands, resulting in development of aeolian dunes. The Orcutt Terrace dune sheet, which underlies the project area, is a combination of ancient aeolian sands deposited at least 60,000 to 80,000 years ago, and sands and gravels deposited by a fluvial system between 25,000 and 32,000 years ago. (Rindlaub, Hunt and Storrer, 1995).

#### Soils

The soils that developed on the ancient dunes of the Orcutt Terrace dune sheet consist of a group collectively referred to as the Orcutt Sands. These sandy soils typically are fast-draining, and may include perched aquifers. There are, however, a few soil types with very slow permeability, or that are underlain by relatively impervious substrates, which are conducive to the development of wetlands on level terrain.

Several different soil types occur within the project area (Table 1). Three different soil series (Figure 2) were mapped by the Soil Conservation Service in the vernal wetlands area on the northern section of the site (Shipman, 1972). Soils of the Betteravia Series are derived from wind-modified marine sands. Although sandy, the permeability of these soils is very slow, and when on level terrain "tends to become boggy after rains" (Shipman, 1972). The hardpan variant of the Narlon Series also occurs in the vernal wetlands area, and consists of loamy sands underlain by cemented sand or clay. Of the soils mapped in the vernal wetlands area, only this Narlon variant is included on the Hydric Soils List (Czarnecki, 1995) as a potentially hydric soil. The third type, the

2




# FIGURE 2

# VERNAL WETLAND SOIL TYPES: WEST ORCUTT PLANNING AREA 8

BmC: Betteravia Loamy Sand OcD3: Oceano Sand NvA: Narlon, Hardpan variant (From Shipman, 1972)

Study Area

**TABLE 1** 

# SOIL UNITS MAPPED BY THE USDA SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE IN THE STUDY AREA<sup>1</sup>

Symbol	Series and Phase	Description / Comments	Available Water Capacity (inches)	Permeability	Salinity (Mmhos./cm. at 25° C.
Bm	Betteravia Series	Moderately well-drained loamy sands.			()- ]
BmA	Betteravia loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes.	"Tends to become boggy after rains."	3.0-4.0	Very slow.	
BmA3	Betteravia loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes, severely eroded.	Loamy sand over a weakly cemented subsoil that may be exposed.	0.5-2.0	Very slow.	
BmC	Betteravia loamy sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes.		2.0-3.5	Very słow.	
Ct— Cu—	Corralitos Series	Loamy sands or sands that are somewhat excessively drained.			[]
CIA	Corralitos sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes.		2.0-4.0	Rapid.	
CLD	Corralitos sand, 2 to 15 percent slopes.		2.0-4.0	Rapid.	
CuA	Corralitos loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes.	Typically found on alluvial fans and floodplains.	4.0-5.0	Rapid.	

ŝ

.					
	Series and Phase	Description / Comments	Available Water Capacity (inches)	Permeability	Salinity (Mmhos./cm. at 25° C
C t C t	orralitos loamy sand, o 9 percent slopes.	Found on alluvial fans and in small valleys interdigitated with hills.	4.0-5.0	Rapid.	
Ē	der Series	Well-drained sandy loams usually found on floodplains and alluvial fans.			I -()
0 t erc	der sandy loam, o 2 percent slopes, ded.	Flood plains subject to deposition, erosion, overflow, and runoff from surrounding areas.	6.0-7.5	Moderately rapid.	
El 2 t erc	der sandy loam, o 9 percent slopes, ded.	Occurs in narrow valleys and on sloping alluvial fans. Subject to runoff. Long, deep gullies are common.	6.0-7.5	Moderately rapid.	
Na Ha	ırlon Series, ırdpan variant.	Potentially hydric. Moderately well- drained soils that formed on old marine terrace deposits. Sand over partially cemented marine sediments.			0-1
N <sup>2</sup> H	ırlon Sand, ırdpan Variant	Potentially hydric. Depth to the sandy clay layer that impedes drainage ranged from 24 to 30 inches. A perched water table often forms after rains or irrigation.	2.0-3.0	Very slow.	
õ	eano Series	Excessively drained, sandy soils.			0-1
2 tc O	eano sand, o 15 percent slopes.		2.0-4.0	. Rapid.	
2 tí sev	eano sand, o 15 percent slopes, erely eroded.	With shallow gullies. Loose sand and blowouts are common in this soil.	2.0-4.0	Rapid.	

illity Salinity (Mmhos./cm. at 25° C	a. No data.
Permeab	No dat
Available Water Capacity (inches)	No data.
Description / Comments	Water-deposited sand, gravel, cobble- stones, and stones in active stream cannels. Deposition and erosion of materials result from streambank erosion. Inundated during high water flows. Development of vegetation is severely limited.
Series and Phase	Rıverwasıh
Symbol	Rs

<sup>1</sup> From Shipman (1972)

Ś

Oceano Series, is characterized by sandy soils with rapid permeability (Shipman, 1972), represented by relictual dunes.

Soils from the Betteravia and Oceano Series are also mapped in the Orcutt Creek drainage (Figure 3). Additional soils series in this area include sandy, rapidly draining soils in the Corralitos Series, sandy loams typical of alluvial and flood plains in the Elder Series, and Riverwash (Shipman, 1972). Of these, only the Riverwash is included on the National List of Hydric Soils (Czarnecki, 1995).

# **Orcutt Creek Wetland Delineation**

## Site Description

As Orcutt Creek flows roughly from east to west through the Orcutt Planning Area, it has a welldefined channel with steep banks along most of its course. However, as it enters Area 8 from the Solomon Road bridge, the creek spreads out over a broad floodplain, although a shallow channel runs along the southern side. This floodplain extends approximately half-way across the site. (Figure 3) from east to west. Floodplain limits to the north and south are well defined by rising sandy hills along most of its length. The northern sand hills are in agricultural use (strawberries). A tributary flows into the creek from the north that is now artificially contoured through a strawberry field. It carries runoff during the rainy season that enters the floodplain at a patch of boggy freshwater marsh. On the southern side a few developments and agricultural fields are located along California State Highway 1. The rest of the land, including most of the creek and the entire floodplain, is used as rangeland for cattle.

Approximately half-way across the site, the stream waters again collect into two deep, welldefined channels. At this location, a small, shallow tributary and an excavated tributary enter the creek from the south. The two main creek channels merge before the creek leaves the site, passing beneath Black Road on the western boundary. An additional major tributary, with nearly vertical banks, enters the creek from the south near the western boundary of the site.

### Methods

Wetland delineation along Orcutt Creek and its tributaries on Area 8 (Key Site 22) follows the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers routine onsite delineation methodology (Wetland Training Institute, 1991). Wetland classification follows the Cowardin et al. (1979) system adapted for





:

coastal Southern California wetlands by Ferren (1988). These wetlands were also classified according to the Holland system (1986) used by the California Department of Fish and Game. Wetland types and their approximate boundaries were mapped during a pedestrian survey of the entire site on May 13 and 15, 1994 by Katherine Rindlaub, botanist. A natural color aerial photograph (Pacific Western, 1991) was also used to determine which areas might include wetlands. On June 10, 1995 wetlands specialist Wayne Ferren joined K. Rindlaub for a field consultation on the eastern half of the Orcutt Creek floodplain. K. Rindlaub and botanist Beth Hendrickson visited the site again on June 11, 1995 to delineate and map the wetland/upland boundaries in questionable areas, sampling the soil where necessary. Data sheets that document wetland sampling stations are included in the Appendix.

The limits of Orcutt Creek and its associated wetlands were mapped in the field on a 1 inch : 200 foot topographic base map with a two foot contour interval. Areas where the wetland/upland boundary was doubtful were determined during the 1994 field reconnaissance. Sampling stations were concentrated in these areas during the 1995 survey. At each sampling station, up to three characteristics were evaluated: vegetation, hydrology, and (if necessary) soils. Each dominant plant species was identified and, where relevant, the relative percent cover was recorded. Taxonomy follows Hickman (1993). Dominant species were classified according to the National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands, Region O (Reed, 1988). If all dominants were classified as obligate (OBL) or facultative wet (FACW) species and the hydrology was suitable, the area was mapped as wetland. The soil was examined in cases where facultative (FACU) species dominated the vegetation, and any FACW species were balanced by facultative upland (FACU) species. In that case, the area was mapped as wetland only when all three criteria were positive (Reed, 1988; Wetland Training Institute, 1991). Water chemistry was deduced from the known characteristics of the dominant species in the vegetation.

The hydrology was determined by the presence or absence of wet soil at the sampling location, by examining the contours of the surrounding area, and considering adjacent land use (e.g., irrigated agriculture). Soil testing consisted of digging a soil pit until wet soil was intercepted within 18 inches depth. A sample of wet soil was examined for evidence gleying, mottling, or oxidized rhizospheres: indicators of a reducing environment. Colors of the soil matrix, gleyed streaks and oxidized rhizospheres were determined using the Munsell Soil Color Charts (Munsell, 1992) and recorded on the data sheet. When all three categories (vegetation, hydrology and soils) met the criteria specified in the manual (Wetland Training Institute, 1991), the area was classified and mapped as wetland.

A herd of cattle occupied the creek floodplain at the time of the surveys. Access was limited in the immediate area where the southern tributary and excavated channel enter the main creek channels due to aggressive behavior displayed by two bulls. Consequently, the wetland/upland boundary is least accurately mapped in this area. Access was similarly constrained along the central section of the northern floodplain.

Areas mapped as wetlands were initially measured using a La Sico Auto Scaler II planimeter. Follow-up measurements were made in some cases to measure different types of wetlands within the larger wetland mapping units using a Tamaya Sokkia Planix 7 planimeter. Each mapping unit was measured three times, and the average value was used to calculate acreage. Initially, the entire floodplain was mapped and measured as one unit. Follow-up measurements estimated areas for riverine channels, freshwater seeps, and freshwater marsh within the floodplain. These wetland area estimates were subtracted from the total floodplain area.

### Results

Wetland Area: A total of 110.35 acres of wetlands was identified and mapped along Orcutt Creek on Planning Area 8. Another 10.4 acres of grasslands that could be wet meadows were also identified, but excluded from the wetland total because the hydrology appeared artificial (sustained by crop irrigation), and/or hydric soil indicators were questionable. The acreages for the different types of wetlands mapped along Orcutt Creek on Area 8 are presented in Table 2. A reduced copy of the 1 inch : 200 foot map showing the jurisdictional wetland limits, transect, and sampling locations is shown in Figure 5.

### Wetland Types:

According to the classification system established by Cowardin et al, (1986), wetlands on the subject property fall into the Riverine and Palustrine Systems. The boundary between these systems is not always clear, and may change from year to year, depending on the amount and pattern of significant storm events. This variability is characteristic of creeks with seasonal or intermittent water regimes in Mediterranean climates (Ferren, 1995). For example, a series of relatively dry years may permit establishment of perennial emergent wetland vegetation characteristic of the Palustrine System within the creek bed. This vegetation may be removed during a year with high velocity flows, and its re-establishment may be prevented during a series of such years. Similarly, an area some distance from the creek channel, normally part of the Palustrine System, may be flooded, and the vegetation buried by silt or sand in high flow years. In





From eastern floodplain, looking southeast toward Highway 1. May 16, 1995.

Orcutt Creek Floodplain

TABLE 2

# **ORCUTT CREEK JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS**

and Type	Acres	Acres
iverine System		19.65
Orcutt Creek Channels <sup>1</sup>	12.51	
Excavated Tributary	0.09	
Floodplain: Depositional <sup>1</sup>	7.05	
alustrine System		90.70
Forested Wetland: Central Coast Riparian Scrub	1.31	
Persistent Emergent Wetland: Wet Meadow <sup>1</sup>	76.78	
West End (8.91 ac)		
Floodplain (67.87 ac <sup>1</sup> )		
Persistent Emergent Wetland: Freshwater Marsh <sup>1</sup>	11.25	
Northern tributary (0.93 ac)		
Floodplain (7.61 ac <sup>1</sup> )		
Southern tributary [golf course] (0.45 ac)		
Impounded pool (0.53 ac)		
Southern stockponds/marsh (1.73 ac)		
Persistent Emergent Wetland: Seeps <sup>1</sup>	0.59	
Non-persistent Emergent Wetland: Vernal Pools and Marsh	0.77	
Wetland Acres	110.35	110.35

<sup>1</sup> Acreage is approximate. The extent of the depositional environment, creek channels, sceps, and healing the field survey. However, the total acreage of the floodplain (wet meadow, depositional environment, freshwater marsh and sceps) was mapped and measured.

δ

that case, it would be regarded as part of the Riverine System that year. Both types of variable, or transitional wetlands were found within the Orcutt Creek drainage system.

### Riverine Wetlands

System: Riverine; Subsystem: Intermittent; Class: Unconsolidated Bottom; Subclass: Vegetated (Non-persistent; Transitional to Palustrine Wetland); Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded; Salinity Regime: Fresh.

Holland Community: Central Coast Riparian Scrub? (Degraded)

The major channels of Orcutt Creek include 12.5 acres that are part of the Riverine System. Vegetation may become established within the banks of this sand bottom streambed during periods of low flow, but it generally is scoured out each year during periods of high flow following storms. Typical dominants are brass buttons (*Cotula coronopifolia*), watercress (*Rorippa nasturtium-aquaticum*), heliotrope (*Heliotropium curassavicum*), halberd-leaf saltbush (*Atriplex patula*), and rabbitsfoot grass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*). Duckweed (*Lemna* sp.) and algal mats appear on and beneath the surface of the water as the level drops, leaving small pools.

The wetland area was mapped using contours on the topographic map that defined the creek channel. On the western half of the site, the nearly vertical banks of the creek channels are clearly delineated on the map. On the eastern half of the site, the creek channel shown on the map is shallow and not well defined. The acreage for this portion of the Riverine System was based on an average channel width of 20 feet. It was included within the initial floodplain measurements. Riverwash soils are hydric (Czarnecki, 1995) and are saturated most, if not all, year.

System: Riverine; Subsystem: Intermittent; Class: Unconsolidated Shore; Subclass: Vegetated? (Transitional to Palustrine Wetland); Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded, Saturated; Salinity Regime: Fresh.

Holland Community: Wet Meadow.

Toward the eastern end of the property, a broad floodplain extends northward from the main creek channel. During periods of high water flow, the creek rises above the relatively shallow banks in this area and flows in temporary braided channels over the wet meadows. In 1995, the unusually high volume and velocity of the water entering this floodplain carried a load of sand that was deposited in a layer several inches thick, burying the wet meadow vegetation. Therefore, in 1995 at least, approximately 7.1 acres of this depositional area is a part of the Riverine, rather





than the Palustrine System. Judging from a 1991 aerial photograph, the heavy rains of that year produced a similar effect.

The gleyed, sandy Riverwash soil with mottles and oxidized rhizospheres found in this depositional environment suggests that this soil is saturated all, or most of the year, if only seasonally flooded. In years of normal rainfall, perennial grasses, such as saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*) may regularly colonize the fresh deposits.

System: Riverine; Subsystem: Intermittent; Class: Excavated Streambed; Subclass: Vegetated (Non-persistent); Water Regime: Intermittent; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Degraded Central Coast Riparian Scrub.

A straight channel running parallel to an access road onto the property from Highway 1 appeared recently cleared in 1994. Mapped as a tributary to the creek by Shipman (1972), it may have been deepened to protect the road and a residence under construction in 1994. This channel is part of a tributary flowing from the golf course through a culvert beneath State Highway 1. The amount or duration of flow it captures is unknown. The sparse vegetative cover observed in 1995 suggests that the flow is sufficient to remove most vegetation that does establish during the growing season. It includes about 0.09 acres, and has a sandy bed.

### Palustrine System

System: Palustrine; Class: Scrub/Shrub Wetland; Subclass: Broad-leaved Deciduous and Evergreen; Water Regime: Phreatophytic and generally not flooded; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Central Coast Riparian Scrub.

A dense growth of large arroyo willows (*Salix lasiolepis*) on the upper banks of the southern tributary near the western end of the property provides nearly complete cover over the creek channel. At the time of the 1995 survey, high velocity water flows had scoured the sandy creekbed, and it appeared that portions of the nearly vertical banks had recently collapsed. Consequently, there was little understory vegetation. In a series of years with average rainfall, these banks would probably support some shade-tolerant riparian understory species, such as mugwort (*Artemisia douglasiana*) and blackberry vines (*Rubus ursinus*). Patches of hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) occurred around the perimeter of the trees where the tributary enters the main creek channel. This tree-lined tributary includes about 1.31 acres.

System: Palustrine; Class: Emergent Wetland; Subclass: Persistent; Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded; Saturated; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Wet Meadow.

On the eastern half of the site, primarily north of the main creek channel, a floodplain lies between sand hills that rise to the north and south. These wet meadows (67.87 acres) are dominated by Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum*). Common associates include bird's-foot trefoil (*Lotus corniculatus*), ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*) and saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*). The main creek channel flows through the meadow along the base of the sandy hills bordering the southern floodplain margin. In most places, the wet meadow extends slightly southward, between the creek and the sand hills. It is more extensive south of the main creek channel where it merges with the mouths of tributaries from the golf course south of State Highway 1. The northern limit of wet meadow similarly extends slightly beyond a poorly defined marshy, secondary channel that runs along the base of the sand hills to the north.

Soil tests were necessary to determine the extent of these meadows. The Corralitos soil mapped by Shipman (1972) is not on the National List of Hydric Soils, but may be associated with alluvial deposits. The wet matrix soil had a low chroma (2), with oxidized rhizospheres, indicating a reducing environment was present in these soils. Although not saturated at the time of the survey, they were still wet several weeks following the last light rains, indicating a wetland hydrologic regime, particularly considering the sandy soil texture.

System: Palustrine; Class: Emergent Wetland, (transitional to Scrub/Shrub Wetland); Subclass: Persistent; Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded; Saturated; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Wet Meadow, transitional to Central Coast Riparian Scrub.

An additional 8.9 acre area of wet meadow was identified at the southwestern corner of the property with an herbaceous layer similar to that observed on the creek floodplain. The limit of this wetland was determined by examining the soil. Although a different type (Elder Series, [Shipman, 1972]), the soil in this area was wet, but not saturated, and included oxidized rhizospheres. A clay layer was encountered three inches beneath the upper sandy loam layer. Sandy loam soil also underlies the clay.

This wetland occupies a swale partly created by impoundment due to the Black Road berm. However, it is part of a much larger swale extending southward of, and bisected by, Highway 1. The bisected swale is the lower end of an additional tributary to Orcutt Creek from the Solomon

Hills. (It was mapped by Shipman (1972) as a drainage or tributary.) Although not culverted beneath Highway I, subsurface water flow originating south of the Highway probably contributes to the maintenance of wetland vegetation and hydric soil. A line of arroyo willows grows along the fence line just outside the property at the base of the Black Road berm.

This meadow apparently is not grazed, and a number of small arroyo willow and mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolius*) shrubs have established there. A small shallow pool, that appeared to be artificial, was found at one of the low spots. The pool did not include any vernal pool indicator species.

System: Palustrine; Class: Emergent Wetland; Subclass: Persistent; Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded; Saturated; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Freshwater Marsh.

Several areas of freshwater marsh were identified along Orcutt Creek. A 0.93 acre patch of freshwater marsh is well developed where a small, degraded tributary enters the creek floodplain from the strawberry fields to the north (northern tributary). Soils in this area were saturated, boggy, and smelled of hydrogen sulfide. A patch of California bulrush (*Scirpus californicus*) was surrounded by brass buttons, watercress, and water bentgrass (*Agrostis semiverticellata*).

Downstream of the bulrush patch, a secondary, intermittent, and poorly defined marshy channel runs along the base of sand hills on the north side of the floodplain. It appears to be fed partly by the strawberry field tributary, partly by seeps, and partly by subsurface flow from the main creek. Towards its western end, before the waters drop into a deeply eroded channel, large shallow pools were observed in the meadow in both 1994 and 1995, located in a low spot near old dunes.

The marshy northern channel is vegetated by a combination of grasses (Mediterranean barley, ryegrass, alkali rye [Leymus triticoides] and saltgrass) and forbs (bird's-foot trefoil, brass buttons). Occasional areas supported spikerush (Eleocharis macrostachya). The southern boundary between this vegetation type and the adjacent wet meadow is approximately mapped. Soils in the approximately 7.61 acre marshy area differed from the wet meadow. They were saturated and boggy, or even flooded. A soil sample was gleyed and mottled, and contained oxidized rhizospheres.

Freshwater marsh vegetation also occurs in the upper, narrow segment of the small tributary draining into Orcutt Creek from the golf course south of Highway 1. Although Mediterranean

barley was dominant, associates included common spikerush. The sandy soil was wet, gleyed, and contained oxidized rhizospheres. This 0.45 acre section of the southern tributary merges into the wet meadow south of the main creek channel.

A large field bordered by the southern property boundary, and located west of the dirt access road, is farmed. Red fescue (*Festuca rubra*) is grown in this irrigated field, apparently for supplemental feed, since the cattle access the area. Irrigation runoff collects in a small tributary that has been widened and dammed for use as a stockpond. The vegetation along this channel and around the pond is dominated by watercress, water bentgrass, rabbitsfoot grass, and brass buttons. A few arroyo willows grow near the mouth of this tributary. The soil was saturated at the surface, and soil samples included oxidized rhizospheres. However, a soil pit near the upper end of the mapped area showed that the hydrology there is the result of surface runoff rather than groundwater. Together, the ponds and the marshy channels that were identified totaled 1.73 acres. The extent of the freshwater marsh vegetation was not mapped within the irrigated area for two reasons. First, it became increasingly difficult to find, as it branched and merged into the grass crop. Second, it appeared that the tiny, shallow channels of marsh vegetation, if they did continue, were increasingly dependent on irrigation.

System: Palustrine; Class: Emergent Wetland; Subclass: Persistent; Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded/Permanently Saturated, Impounded?; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Coastal Freshwater Marsh.

A small shallow pond is located along State Highway 1 (southern property line) at about the middle of the site next to an access road. This approximately 0.6 acre pond is densely vegetated by California bulrush. Soils were saturated. The source of the water that supports this apparently impounded area is unclear, since it did not appear to be fed directly through the nearby culvert. A sign warning of unsafe water suggested the water may be collected from the golf course south of Highway 1.

System: Palustrine; Class: Emergent Wetland; Subclass: Non-persistent; Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland System: Vernal Pools and Vernal Marsh?

The Black Road berm impounds runoff on the creek floodplain north of the Orcutt Creek channel, resulting in a seasonally flooded water regime. Vegetation in the lower center of this impounded area was strongly dominated by vernal pool plants, particularly white everlasting (*Gnaphalium*)

palustre). Other species included prostrate vervrain (Verbena bracteata), common spikerush (Eleocharis macrostachya), willow dock (Rumex salicifolius), curve-pod yellow-cress (Rorippa curvisiliqua), and least spikerush (Eleocharis acicularis).

The extent of two merged vernal pools was mapped using white everlasting as the indicator species (0.33 acre). The pools are surrounded by vernal marsh (0.44 acre). Although runoff impounded by the road berm has undoubtedly enhanced the wetland character of this area, its location at the base of a sandy hill suggests it supported some wetland before the road was built. Most of the sandy hills in the Orcutt area surveyed in 1995 had freshwater seeps along the slope toes where the hills terminated along alluvial soils (Rindlaub, Hunt, and Storrer, 1995).

System: Palustrine; Class: Emergent Wetland; Subclass: Persistent; Water Regime: Seasonally Saturated; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Freshwater Seep.

The sandy hills that delineate the northern and southern limit of the Orcutt Creek floodplain seep groundwater at their bases. The vegetation is dominated by Mediterranean barley, and is continuous with the floodplain wet meadow, except for a few areas along the southern hills where the seep joins the riverine wetland. These seeps extend two to three feet above the break in grade at the base of the hill. They were not mapped separately, so the 0.6 acre extent was estimated and subtracted from the wet meadow acreage. These seeps were found primarily along the floodplain margin on the eastern section of the site.

Classification of these seeps as jurisdictional wetland is marginal, because the soil criterion was not clear. However, these seeps are probably strongly seasonal, with variable duration of water flow from year to year, depending on rainfall. Consequently, hydric soil characteristics could be minimally developed.

System: Palustrine, Transitional to Riverine; Class: Emergent Wetland; Subclass: Persistent; Water Regime: Seasonally Flooded, Saturated; Salinity Regime: Fresh. Holland Community: Freshwater Marsh?

Where silt and sand build up into small bars at curves in the creek channel, small patches of more persistent emergent vegetation develop. These were dominated by three-square bulrush (*Scirpus pungens*), young cattails (*Typha* sp.), spikerushes (*Eleocharis* sp.), brown-headed rush (*Juncus phaeocephalus*), and arroyo willow seedlings. These patches of vegetation may persist for many

years along the margin of the creek bed, or may be removed in years of high velocity flows. Because these patches were small (cumulatively less than 1 acre), and included within the creek channel, their acreage was not calculated separately from the Riverine system.

# Discussion

Delineation of Palustrine Wetlands largely dominated by facultative species often required soil testing to determine whether characteristics of a reducing environment were present. Most of the soils in this area are sandy; sandy soils usually are well drained. Precipitation, and consequent runoff on and below the soil surface is normally confined to a few months of the year. Given these factors, hydric soil characteristics are likely to be poorly developed. It is also likely some of these sandy soils dry out for part of the year. Consequently, low matrix chroma, mottles and oxidized rhizospheres were the characteristics usually used to determine that wet or saturated soils were indeed hydric, despite the fact that these sandy soil types are not included in the National List of Hydric Soils.

The boundary of these wetlands, once it had been determined that an area did qualify as a jurisdictional wetland, usually was more straight-forward due to abrupt changes in topography that would directly affect the hydrological regime. These changes in grade usually were associated with shifts in dominant species in the vegetation, or from wet to dry soil.

Where Orcutt Creek flows in deep, well-defined channels the map clearly showed the limits of the riverine wetland system. A portion of the creek floodplain (depositional environment) is included in the riverine system because it apparently is inundated in most years.

The mapped boundary between freshwater marsh and wet meadow along the northern floodplain margin is approximate. Access was restricted in the central section due to breeding cattle. The width of the marshy secondary channel is probably more variable than the mapped area indicates. Therefore, the acreage of marsh vs. wet meadow is also an approximation. However, the total area including both these wetland types was mapped and measured.

Two areas of possible wetlands were identified on the southern section of Site 22. One is a small fenced area of possible wet meadow located between the creek and the irrigated field. This 3.03 acre area was not included among the Palustrine Wetlands because the hydrology appeared to be artificial, resulting from irrigation. The soil sample did, however, contain oxidized rhizospheres. Facultative species, ryegrass and bird's-foot trefoil, dominate the vegetation.

The second problematic area is located south of the creek at the southeastern corner. The flats in this 7.4 acre section appeared to support wet meadow vegetation, fed by seepage from the surrounding hills. However, the soils test was inconclusive, since the presence of oxidized rhizospheres was difficult to determine, and groundwater was not intercepted by a soil pit dug to 18 inches depth.

The linear, excavated channel from Highway I onto the property is classified here as a part of the Riverine System. However, it has little vegetation, and the soils were not tested. It has been in place for at least 23 years (as shown in Shipman, 1972), and is a continuation of a southern tributary to Orcutt Creek. However, due to minimal vegetative cover, it could be argued that it is not part of a vegetated wetland system, but should be classified as Other Waters of the United States. In either case, it would come under U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction.

Orcutt Creek on Area 8 offers excellent opportunities for wetland restoration. A general lack of trees is one of the unusual aspects of the creek on the site. Without constant disturbance, it would probably support willows, but willow shrubs and trees are uncommon on this site. Consequently, it could be classified as a degraded example of Holland's (1986) Central Coast Riparian Scrub. Farther upstream, willows are common along the creek banks, and would be expected to grow here. Near the western end of the site, where a fence excludes most cattle from the creek channel, occasional large arroyo willows (*Salix lasiolepis*) occur on the creek banks. Seedling willows also were observed on sand bars in the creek.

Along the northern margin of the floodplain, a few large, scattered arroyo willows occupy the transition between the wet meadow and the northern marshy creek channel. Several standing dead trees are among them. The cattle use this area for shade, as a bedding area, and rub against the trees. Without constant grazing, this area (at least) would probably develop into a forested or shrub-dominated wetland. The main creek channel on the south side of the meadow, with its sand bars, shallow banks and possibly annual flooding, would possibly support thickets of narrow-leaved willow (*Salix exigua*).

The wet meadow on the floodplain has also been influenced by past land use. The dominant grass, Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum*), is introduced, but patches of native perennial grasses, particularly saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), and creeping wild-rye (*Leymus triticoides*) are scattered among the predominantly introduced plants. Unless it is too wet, the meadow may historically

have supported patches of scrub, such as coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*) and goldenbush (*Isocoma menziesii*), both facultative wetland species.

# Delineation of Vernal Wetlands North of or Bisected by an Unpaved Agricultural Access Road

# Site Description

Located south and east of the Tanglewood housing development, the vernal wetlands area of Area 8 is composed of small northwest/southeast trending dunes surrounded by flats and swales (Figure 2). Soils underlain by impervious clays or cemented sands slow water percolation and permit water to collect in low areas in the topography (Shipman, 1972). Vernal wetland development is fostered by this variation in topographic relief, which ranges from a few inches to well-defined bowls that dip several feet below the surrounding area. Vernal ponds, pools and flats are scattered across this part of Site 22, often in amorphous complexes following minor changes in elevation. Although locations of larger pools and ponds were mapped, the level of detail needed to capture the intricate variation among vernal wetland types was beyond the scope of this survey.

In 1995, the potential wetland extent on this uneven topography was clarified by the unusually heavy rains of January and March. The deeper bowls filled with water, persisting as ponds well beyond the end of May, and providing habitat for amphibians and waterfowl (Rindlaub, Hunt, and Storrer, 1995). Shallower depressions dried earlier, with vernal pool species emerging and flowering in sequence as soil moisture decreased from the edge to the center of the pools. Many of these pools and ponds were interconnected by vernal flats, shallow swales and vernal marsh.

### Methods

Many of the vernal wetlands in this section of Area 8 were surveyed and mapped earlier by Olson (1991). Olson's report included a map and discussion of the soils identified on the site by the USDA Soils Conservation Service (Shipman, 1972). A natural color aerial photograph of the site (Pacific Western, 1991) suggested additional wetlands could be found outside the area mapped by Olson (1991). The focus of this survey is to confirm and augment Olson's work. The entire site was covered by a pedestrian survey, and wetlands were mapped by Katherine Rindlaub, botanist, and Kathy Frye, field assistant, on May 6, May 12 and June 14, 1995. Wetland boundaries were drawn in the field on a 1 inch : 200 foot topographic base map with a contour interval of two feet. Wetland classification is based on that adapted from Cowardin et al, (1986) as modified for coastal southern California wetlands by Ferren (1988) and on Olson (1991).

Several additional pools were identified and mapped on the eastern portion of the site. Voucher specimens were collected for these new wetlands, and will be deposited at the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden Herbarium. Wetlands specialist Wayne Ferren accompanied K. Rindlaub for a field consultation on June 10, 1995, to advise on classification and species identification.

The Cowardin (1979) system was used to delineate wetlands on this part of Site 22. Unlike the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers methodology, the Cowardin methodology requires that only one of three criteria must be satisfied to determine an area is a wetland: vegetation, hydrology, or soils. Vegetation was the primary criterion used to determine the wetland/upland boundary. The most useful species, because it was nearly omnipresent in the wetlands, was brown-headed rush (*Juncus phaeocephalus*). This species was selected because it appeared to best represent the margins of isolated pools and ponds. It is a perennial facultative wetland (FACW) species (Reed, 1988). Where it comprised at least 50% cover, the area was mapped as wetland. Use of the 50% cover criterion for this species brings the wetland delineation criterion in line with that used for vegetation by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Occasionally water pygmy weed (*Crassula aquatica*) was used as an indicator when topography and hydrology indicated the area was a wetland, but brown-headed rush was absent or uncommon. Other facultative species, such as the annual toad rush (*Juncus bufonius*) were so wide-spread in 1995 that they were not useful, appearing frequently in areas that did not appear to be true wetlands.

In some areas, hydrology was used to delineate wetland; although the brown-headed rush was usually present as well. Areas where the soil was wet during the surveys (which occurred several weeks after the last major storm of the season) were mapped as wetland based on hydrology.

Soils were not tested for hydric indicators on this part of Site 22. The Hardpan Variant of Narlon soils on the western portion of the site is underlain by a clay layer, which inhibits drainage and may be hydric (Czarnecki, 1995). Vernal wetlands were also found on sandy Betteravia soils. Exposure of the cemented sand that forms the B horizon of Betteravia soils (Shipman, 1972) on the site suggested that the A horizon is very shallow across much of the site, allowing the B horizon to function like a hardpan in restricting drainage. The restricted drainage of both these soil types has fostered vernal wetland development.

Olson's work (1991, 1992) indicated that most, if not all, the central area was wetland, therefore, mapping was generally restricted to measuring in from the perimeter fence until a wetland area was encountered, using a 150 foot tape. On the eastern quarter of the site, wetlands were often



# FIGURE 6

# VERNAL POND

North end of Area 8 (Site 22), about 500 feet north of agricultural access road.

Western Spadefoot Toad and California Tiger Salamander larvae were found in this pond in 1995 (Rindlaub, Hunt, and Storrer, 1995).

Tanglewood housing development is in the background.

widely separated, so transects were measured both from north to south and west to east to determine the relative location of the wetlands with reference to the fence.

Areas mapped as wetlands were initially measured using a La Sico Auto Scaler II planimeter. Follow-up measurements were made in some cases to measure different types of wetlands within the larger wetland mapping units using a Tamaya Sokkia Planix 7 planimeter. Each mapped unit was measured three times, and the average value was used to calculate acreage. A few samples of very small mapping units were checked for approximate acreage using graph paper with 100 squares per inch.

# Results

A total of 40.91 acres of wetlands was identified in the vernal wetlands area north of or bisected by the unpaved agricultural access road on Site 22 (Table 3). Separate acreages were calculated for wetland types with discrete boundaries within limitations of time and equipment. These include 9.087 acres of vernal ponds, 6.497 acres of vernal pools, 1.461 acres of vernal swales, 0.063 acre of vernal depressions, and 0.213 acres of freshwater marsh. The remaining 23.590 acres were classified as vernal flats. Mapping the intricacies of variation within these flats was beyond the scope of this survey. A reduced copy of the 1 inch : 200 foot map is shown in Figure 7.

# Discussion

Vernal pools are widely recognized as possibly the most rare and endangered wetland type in California (Ferren and Pritchett, 1988). These unusual wetlands form in depressions underlain by an impermeable layer, often clay or a hardpan. The depressions are inundated during winter rains, and slowly evaporate following the rainy season, usually drying out by late spring or summer. A number of plants are specifically associated with vernal pools; plants that have evolved to tolerate the unusual growth conditions (unfavorable for most species) of the vernal pool water regime. Some of these species occur only in vernal pools (Ferren and Pritchett, 1988).

Because they are often located on relatively flat terrain, development potentially threatens most of southern California's remaining vernal pools. Many of Santa Barbara County's vernal pools are located on coastal terraces with potentially high real estate value. Most of these coastal pools are located on heavy clay soils, typical of many vernal pool sites. Within Santa Barbara County, only a subset of the north County vernal pools are located on sandy soils (Ferren and Pritchett, 1988;

# TABLE 3

# AREA 8 (SITE 22)

# VERNAL POOLS AND VERNAL WETLANDS COMPLEXES

### NORTH OF AND BISECTED BY

## AN UNPAVED AGRICULTURAL ACCESS ROAD

Wetland Type	Acres
Freshwater Marsh	0.213
Vernal Pond	9.087
Vernal Pool	6.497
Vernal Flat	23.590
Vernal Swale	1.461
Vernal Depression	0.063
Total Acres	40.911



Olson. 1992) such as those on the subject site. The effect of these sandy substrates on the floristic composition of north County pools, if any, is unstudied (Olson, 1992).

According to Olson (1991), the vernal pool and wetland complex on Site 22 is the "finest vernal pool site in Santa Barbara County." No Federally or State listed plant species were found on or reported from this site. However, the only recent Santa Barbara County record for a CNPS List 4 species (Skinner and Pavlik, 1994), large-flowered linanthus (*Linanthus grandiflora*) was rediscovered during field surveys. This site is the southern distributional limit for this species (Wilken, 1995), believed extirpated in the County (Skinner and Pavlik, 1994). A number of locally sensitive wetland species also were documented on this site (Olson, 1991).

California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), a Category 1 candidate for Federal listing, and Western spadefoot toad (*Spea hammondii*), a Category 2 candidate for Federal listing, were found in some of the pools on the site in spring of 1995. Both these species utilize vernal pools for a portion of their life cycle. Both species also use rodent burrows in the surrounding upland habitats as retreat sites. The grassland habitats over most of this site constitute excellent foraging habitat for raptors, including the golden eagle, observed feeding on the site in spring of 1995. (Rindlaub, Hunt, and Storrer, 1995).

It is strongly recommended that this vernal wetland complex be preserved, protected, and actively managed. Due to the seasonal nature of this type of wetland, it is most vulnerable to disturbances, such as those that cause soil compaction, when the soils are wet. Cattle were pastured on the vernal wetland area in spring of both 1994 and 1995. Not only do cattle compact the soil, trample and graze on the plants, but they frequently were observed bedding down in drying vernal pools and swales. Trampling in the uplands also potentially impacts the sensitive amphibian species that use rodent burrows as retreats. According to Olson (1991), human disturbance has included people walking dogs or using the site as a short-cut, and riding dirt bikes through pool areas before they dry out. An agricultural access road was constructed through one of the larger pools. The proximity to a housing development renders the site, and its sensitive species, vulnerable to continued negative impacts. Current fire protection for the development appears to include disking a broad swath along the fenceline. Better fencing, a community education program, and active management will be needed to protect and preserve these wetlands.

Despite the negative aspect of the site's location adjacent to a housing project, the location otherwise is ideal for a preserve. Vernal wetlands continue off the site to the north and east, which is Santa Maria Airport property. Due to restrictions on development imposed around airport runways and below flight paths, the opportunity exists to extend a protected wetland area beyond the boundary of the subject site.

Protection and management of this site would require development of a management plan, and funding. A management plan could include light use of the site as an educational resource for schools and for the community as a whole. A trail that included boardwalks over sensitive wetland areas could accommodate those who wish to observe the pools closely, and well as offering opportunities for bird-watchers. Outreach education to the surrounding community should be an important facet of a management plan. Pets should not be permitted to roam on the site, and off-road vehicles (including dirt bikes) should be prohibited. Fire protection should be accomplished through mowing, rather than disking, and should be delayed until the soil has dried out. The possible expansion of aggressive weedy species following removal of cattle would require monitoring and appropriate controls.

Preservation and protection, to be effective, must include the entire site. Fragmentation of these habitats could destroy the wetland hydrology, which differs fundamentally from wetlands in general. Wetlands associated with a waterway, for example, receive runoff from a watershed, which may be located miles away. In contrast, the relatively flat topography which includes the vernal wetlands on Area 8 appears to be an isolated, self-contained system. The water that permits development and persistence of these vernal wetlands apparently is derived from percolation and runoff from the uplands in the immediate area, as well as on intercepted precipitation. The sensitive wildlife species found on this site also rely on the surrounding uplands in addition to the vernal pools and ponds. Therefore, the surrounding uplands must be considered as an integral component of this wetland system.

# <u>Summary</u>

Two areas of wetlands were delineated on a West Orcutt Planning Area site. Area 8, or Site 22, includes a number of different types of wetlands. The areas surveyed for this report are those associated with Orcutt Creek, on the southern end of the site, and a complex of vernal wetlands at the northern end.

The Orcutt Creek wetlands were delineated and mapped using the methodology for a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers routine on-site delineation. A total of 110.35 acres of wetlands was mapped, including 19.65 acres in the Riverine System, and 90.70 acres in the Palustrine System. Wetlands were classified according to the Cowardin and Holland systems. A large expanse of wet meadow

and freshwater marsh occupies the broad floodplain on the eastern half of the site along the creek. Other wetlands are associated with natural and modified tributaries that flow into the Orcutt Creek channels on the remainder of the site. One small area of vernal wetland has been created or enhanced by construction of Black Road.

Most of the Orcutt Creek wetlands are degraded, probably due to years of grazing. Few woody plants were encountered along the creek or on the floodplain, except in small areas where cattle are excluded. Removal of the cattle would provide excellent opportunities for wetland enhancement through restoration of woody riparian vegetation, and expansion of herbaceous perennial emergent wetland species.

The system of vernal wetlands on the northern section of Area 8 includes approximately 15.58 acres of vernal ponds and pools, and 25.33 acres of vernal flats, swales, depressions, and marsh. Vegetation and hydrology were used to define the limits of these wetlands, building on the work completed earlier by Olson (1991). It appeared that the wetland complexes in the central area of the site were interconnected in 1995, due to the exceptionally high rainfall in the winter and spring. Vernal ponds remained inundated well into the month of May. These pools were used by waterfowl and by amphibian species that are candidates for Federal listing. Although uplands are interspersed among the vernal wetlands, water percolation from the dunes contributes to the maintenance of vernal wetland hydrology. Surrounding uplands also provide retreat sites for sensitive amphibian species following metamorphosis from the larval forms that develop in the vernal ponds.

Current land use practices on this rare and valuable wetland site are not geared to wetland protection or preservation. Cattle are pastured on these vernal wetlands in the spring, while standing water is available. But vernal wetlands are most vulnerable to negative impacts during this same period, while the soils are wet and plants are actively growing.

This vernal wetland complex is one of the finest examples of its kind in Santa Barbara County. It deserves protection and active management for preservation and enhancement. Establishment of a preserve on this site is also recommended because these vernal wetlands are contiguous with similar vernal pools, swales and marshes to the northeast on Santa Maria Airport property. Development constraints associated with airports could be incorporated into a preserve design, extending the protected wetland area, increasing its value as a refuge for sensitive wildlife species.



### References

- Cowardin, Lewis M., Virginia Carter, Francis Golet and Edward T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-79/31.
- Czarnecki, Gerald. 1995. District Conservationist. USDA Soil Conservation Service, Santa Maria, California. Personal communication, July 13, 1995.
- Ferren, Wayne R., Jr. 1988. A Preliminary and Partial Classification of Southern California Wetlands. Prepared for a Workshop organized by the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden. The Herbarium, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Ferren, Wayne R. 1995. Herbarium Scientist. Department of Biological Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara, California. Personal communication.
- Ferren, Wayne R., Jr. and David A. Pritchett. 1988. Enhancement, Restoration, and Creation of Vernal Pools at Del Sol Open Space and Vernal Pool Reserve, Santa Barbara County, California. The Herbarium, Department of Biological Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara. Environmental Report No. 13.
- Hickman, James C., Editor. 1993. The Jepson Manual, Higher Plants of California. University of California Press.
- Holland, Robert F. 1986. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. California Department of Fish and Game, Non-Game Heritage Program. Sacramento.
- Holland, V.L. 1991. Draft Botanical Survey Orcutt West 4 Project Site, Santa Barbara County, California. Prepared for Urban Planning Concepts, Inc. June 27.
- Munsell Color, Kollmorgen Instruments Corporation. 1992. Munsell Soil Color Charts. Revised Edition.
- Olson, Mark 1991. Evaluation of the Orcutt Vernal Pools, Santa Barbara County, California. A report to The Santa Barbara County Resource Management Department, Planning Division. September 13. Santa Barbara, California.
  - \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 1992. Vernal Pools of Northern Santa Barbara County, California. A report presented to the Santa Barbara County Resource Management Department. The Herbarium, Department of Biological Sciences. University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California.
- Pacific Western Aerial Surveys. 1991. Color aerial photograph No. PW 43295-1-11, dated July 29, 1991.

- Reed, Porter B. 1988. National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands: California (Region O). U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv. Biol. Rep. 88(26.10).
- Rindlaub, Katherine. 1994. Botanical Resources Survey of Selected Sites in the Orcutt Area. Letter to Elihu Gevirtz, Santa Barbara County Planning and Development. June 27.
- Rindlaub, Katherine, Lawrence Hunt and John Storrer. 1995. Biological Resources Assessment for Selected Key Sites within the Orcutt Planning Area. Final Report. Prepared by Katherine Rindlaub Biological Consulting for the County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department.
- Shipman, Gordon E. 1972. Soil Survey of Northern Santa Barbara Area, California. U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. In cooperation with the University of California Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Skinner, Mark W. and Bruce M. Pavlik. 1994. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California. California Native Plant Society Special Publication No. 1, Fifth Edition.
- Smith, Clifton F. 1976. A Flora of the Santa Barbara Region, California. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. Santa Barbara, California.
- Wetland Training Institute. 1991. Field Guide for Wetland Delineation: 1987 Corps of Engineers Manual. WTI 91-2. 133 pp.
- Wilkin, Dieter. 1995. Director of Research, Santa Barbara Botanic Garden. Personal communication regarding large-flowered linanthus collection from Site 22, reviewed by R. Patterson, San Francisco State University. 8 June 1995.

# APPENDIX

# DATA SHEETS

		<b>D</b> 4 <b>T</b> -	50.D.1		
RO	UTINE ON	DATA SITE DET	FORM FRMINATION METH	oni	
Field Investigator(s) Katherine C	ind bach	BIHO WAR	durates as	00	ALCON A
Project/Site: 10 cull Philipping Apren C	t 21 Ore	it Citicia	State: (// C	ate:	111115
Applicant/Owner: - Suntre Burter	H. Count	- Plan	t Community #/Name	Tribedance	A Branchersch
	tion is nece	ëssary, us	e the back of data for	n or a field no	otebook.
Do normal environmental conditions	exist at the	 • plant cor			·
Yes <u>%</u> No (If no, explain	on back)	1			
$Yes$ No $X \gtrsim 2$ (If yes explain	frology bee	n significa	intly disturbed?		
		VEGE	TATION		~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~
Dominant Plant Species	Indicator	Ctrature	Dominant Direct O		Indicator
1 Loluzia multiflorino	· EA /	Juatum Leul	Dominant Plant Spe	CIOS	Status Stratun
2. Bronnesmellis	FARM-	UTCT-W	12		
3. Hemizonia mereseens			13		
4. tolyparis menspeliensis	FACUIT		14		
6 hulling Manue	-FIAC-		15		
7. Lactuca serviola	FAC		16		
8			18		
9			19		
			20		
Percent of dominant species that ar	e OBL, FA	CW, and/	or FAC <u>50%</u>		
Rationale:	on met?	Yes <u>×</u>	_ No		
holivin may be an	widuato	r yor w	etlandes in the	project a	
		so	ILS	0	
Series/phase:			Subaroup.2		
Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes	<u>No X</u>	Undetermined		
Is the soil: Mottled? Ves	No X	Histic epip	edon present? Yes	No _X	
Matrix Color: $10 \sqrt{R} 5/3$		Gieyea? 	Yes No 🔀 Colors:		
Other hydric soil indicators:le	ne.				
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye	S	No 😕	0 1	F	
Training The Reporte Ser	1 marc	ators	tound. Lea	mujsienel	
		HVDP			
	Vac				
Is the ground surface inundated?	100	140	Surrace water dep	th:	
ls the ground surface inundated? ` Is the soil saturated? Yes	No ×				
ls the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so	No <u>×</u> pil probe ho	ole:lo	on: to 14"		
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface ir	No <u>k</u> pil probe ho nundation c	ole:b or soil satu	ration.		
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface ir  Is the wetland hydrology criterion me	No <u>×</u> bil probe ho nundation c	ole:b or soil satu 	ration.		
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale:	No <u>k</u> bil probe ho hundation c et? Yes Wet, bu	ble:b br soil satu No No	mai to 14" ration.	m cover	IVIPLIAR BUTMALE
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface in stationale:	No <u>k</u> bil probe ho nundation c at? Yes wet, bu	ble:b br soil satu No <u> No  Ver e</u> tpta	<u>precises included</u>	m cover	include Bronus
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface in sthe wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale:	No <u>×</u> pil probe ho hundation c hundation	ble:b or soil satu Na ג עפר פו ג עפר פו ג עפר פו ג עפר פו	mi to 14" pration. <u>Decision included</u> min taxa. MINATION AND RAT	M Cover	include Bronus
Is the ground surface inundated? Yes Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale: <u>Soil is damp</u> <u>Molliss and Lupinics var</u> JURISE	No <u>k</u> bil probe ha bundation c at? Yes <u>wet</u> , bu hus, bol DICTIONAL	ble:b br soil satu <u>No</u> <u>k weba</u> b weba DETERI	mi to 14" pration. <u>X</u> precises included ma taxa. MINATION AND RAT	M Cover	include Bronus
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface ir Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale: <u>Soil is damp</u> <u>JURISE</u> is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision:	No <u>k</u> bil probe ho hundation c at? Yes <u>wet</u> bu hus, bo DICTIONAL Yes	ble:b br soil satu <u>Ner e</u> t <u>b DETERI</u> NoX	MINATION AND RAT	M Cover	include Bronus

~~·..
Atahon#2

RO	DATA FORM	WETHOD <sup>1</sup>	
Field Investigator(s): Kathurum (	Lindlaul,	Deter	
Project/Site: Orcult Planming Are	Entrance Christer State: CA	- Date: <u>- arr</u> County: Cata	the Bastan
Applicant/Owner: <u>Zenta Bartbar</u> Note: If a more detailed site descrip	The Community #/	Name: Wet Mund	
Do normal environmental conditions	exist at the plant community?		
Yes <u>//</u> No (If no, explain Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy	n on back) drology been significantly disturbed?		
Yes <u>'</u> No (If yes, explain	n on back)		
	VEGETATION		
Outre Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratum Dominant Plan	t Species	Indicator Status Stratum
802 1 Inliver multiflow	FAC Hereby ++		
217, 2 Polypoorin with spellensis	$\frac{1}{F_{A}(w)^{+}} = \frac{1}{12}$		
10% 3. Trifolium vepens	FARUT 13		
21754. RUMERICATISPEN	FACW- 14.		
412 5. Lotus corniculatus	<u>FAC</u> 15.		
417. 6. Pickis echioides	<u> </u>		
5% 7. Hordeum hystrix	<u>[AC 12 17.</u>		
8	18		
9	19		
	20		
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale: <u>The shift form</u>	ion met? Yes <u>V</u> NoNo Surracumation area, with	Mostly FAC Spe	cire, to this wet
area mappied as wet On	Lyone FACIL SP, US. 2 FACU	0 sp.	
	SOILS		
Series/phase:	LOVER OAWATN3" Subara	m·2	
Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes No X Undeterm	ined	
Is the soil a Histosol? Yes	No <u>X</u> Histic epipedon present?	Yes No	
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes	No X Gleyed? Yes 1	No $\frac{1}{\chi}$	
Matrix Color: 1048 3/1 Learny 54-	Mottle Colors:	clai	10 YR 312
Other hydric soil indicators:	☆		)
Bationale: (1) provide the set of the	es // No		e fi
Claydonome in a loe lour	er than 3	<u>s m. allenteum</u>	iting upland.
-	HYDROLOGY		
Is the ground surface inundated?	Yes No X Surface wat	ter depth:	
Is the soil saturated? Yes	No X		
Depth to free-standing water in pit/s	soil probe hole:		
List other field evidence of surface	inundation or soil saturation.	(autoric las com	le.
Is the wetland bydrolody criterion	1012 Vac VI No	The for is when the	<u>.</u>
Rationale: Clay Jouer Like	la vetaxis daralogase. Ale	ter to all a	1 cmc con und
hout 3 win this and him	1 16 Canto Where of an for	and the former of	Surgar and the former of the
JURIS	DICTIONAL DETERMINATION AN	D RATIONALE	Party road being , partey
Is the plant community a wetland?	Yes 🏸 Na	nla	rulating mong ground
Rationale for jurisdictional decision:	Although the hydrologic 15 pas	Hunsphird H.	ad ter louis a tren
near the correle may alican	10 have received more around	whiter Allmort	held hear the surface
1 This data form can be used for the	Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure	and the Plant Com	cc'
Assessment Procedure.	,		loting

<sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

1-36

RC Field Investigator(s): <u>Kathamina</u> Project/Site: <u>Orault Planning Am</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Barbar</u> Note: If a more detailed site descri	DUTINE ONSIT Rindlaub 1 15/12 20: Ora 20 County 20100 is pecess	DATA E DET <u>Sciluli</u> <u>Mick</u> – Plant	FORM ERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> Ladvick group Date: State: <u>CA</u> County t Community #/Name: <u>Ule</u> a the back of data form or	G/i /: t meador	1/95 tra Barch w francht	rance Jonal to Se	rub1 +120
Do normal environmental condition Yes <u>N</u> No (If no, explai Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy Yes <u>N</u> No <u>S</u> (If yes, explai	s exist at the pl n on back) drology been s n on back)	lant cor	nmunity?				I
		VEGE					
Dominant Plant Species 1. Lottom muth Alaron 2. Polypagoo manopeliensis 3. Rumer crispus 4. Baliry Histolepis 5. Energy histolepis 6. Trifolium repens 7. Cyperus enarroshis 8. Pieris echicades 9. Elymas triheoides lleymu 10. Cardena Araba Percent of dominant species that a ls the hydrophytic vegetation crites Rationale: The presence of Withow &	Indicator Status St FAC $FAC$	ratum Lorb ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '	Dominant Plant Species           11.           12.           13.           14.           15.           16.           17.           18.           19.           20.           or FAC           No           anth Recommended Strength Strengt Strengt Strength Strength Strength Strength Strength Strength	(éypérus)			
VI VULTUM	- Mend , 25 67 63	Jedius C	15 an OBL Species		- /t		
Series/phase: <u>Loamy Sand</u> Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes Is the soil: Mottled? Yes Matrix Color: <u>IO YR 3/1 (Le</u> Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Clau</u> Is the hydric soil indicators: <u>Clau</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>The clay layer</u> Area. <u>Matrix Arrona in</u> Layer to lacking	Yes NoHis NoHis NoGlu amy sized) y ICVR 3/2 esNo beneath + 1 compar	No <u>×</u> No <u>×</u> stic epip eyed? Mottle	Undetermined Undetermined Dedon present? Yes Yes No X Colors: <u>Oxidized rhizo</u> <u>amin sand man n</u> ith 3 in our ound	No X 22neves. etava dr ung upi	uinar, e and wh	in this ine clar	
is the ground surface inundated?	Yes	No	Surface water depth: .				
Is the soil saturated? Yes M Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface Soil is not saturated, b	No <u>×</u> soil probe hole inundation or s	: soil satu	Itayer at 3" is ve	my whit			
Is the wetland hydrolody criterion r	net? Yes X	2 N	o	<u> </u>			

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes $arnothing$	No	
Rationale for jurisdictional decision: Some us	actation is PBL, exidized vhiscophymican	Phe ford in
soila. Clay laws probably holdowater n	insurface. Chromais Low Although	managentical Inna
<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil.	Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community	boad Verm, the surround-
Assessment Procedure.	Must play to any EACUD and EAC	topser wappy suggests
<sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."	The First war One Did second	this man alle up have
	VS FACK, par Une consignation	Gena pecale
		when the fore rules and

Station # 4

## DATA FORM

Field Investigator(s): Kallus - C.	JINE ON	SHEDEL Sull dan	ERMINATION METHOD	Li. I.c.
Project/Site: Orall Planing down C	voul fir s	4110 7 2.	Date:	6/11/45
Applicant/Owner: Scala Basa	Country		State: County:	<u>zianta Barbarz</u>
Note: If a more detailed site descript	ion is nea		t Community #/Name: <u>It duri</u>	h even hat prove
			= $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$	ald notebook.
Do normal environmental conditions	exist at the	e plant cor		
Yes No. V (If no explain	on hack)	o plant col	nnunny (	
Has the vegetation, soils, and/or byd	rology has	n nignifion	ptly disturbado	
Yes Y No (If yes explain	on back)	in signinea		
	on backy			
		VECE		
	Indicator	AEGE	TATION	Indicator
Dominant Plant Species	Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratum
1 Catula commonaladia	FACINE	Herdo		
2 Polyopaga manipulations	FINIT	110(10	12	
3 Abruhan pabella	FACIN		12	
4. PICAS PCRUEIdes	FAC *		13	
5. Anazallis anensis	FAC		16	
6. Rumeri eruspuis	FACin-		16	
7. Jun eus bonjonicis	FACINT		17	······································
8hything m hursson to live	FACW		18	
9. Dispehlis aprication	FACW		19	
10			20	
Percent of dominant species that ar				
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criteric	UDL, FA	Vaa koo	DFFAC 10070	_
Bationale:All Social	л нөн оза са	CHEAC	- INO	
· · ·	<u></u>	Contraction of the second		
		·····		
1	1	SO	ILS NOT SAMPLED	
Series/phase: Sam	-51		Subaroup: <sup>2</sup>	
Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes	No	Undetermined	· · ·
Is the soil a Histosol? Yes	No	Histic epip	pedon present? Yes N	0
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes	No	Gleyed?	YesNo	
Matrix Color:		Mottle	Colors:	
Other hydric soil indicators:				
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes	s	No	· ·	
Hallonale: <u>AM Species</u>	FAC II	<u>ACiu)</u>	Appears this is a ve	laturly recent pool
- freuting of conception of bi	urbed (17)	helps rue	st) Perhaps no OB2 spec	ies pravebeen ask po
i ginal the		HYDRO	OLOGY	
Is the ground surface inundated?	les X	No	Surface water dopth-	
Is the soil saturated? Yes 🔨	No		contace water depth	
Depth to free-standing water in pit/so	il probe h	ole: <u>Su</u>	abace_	
List other field evidence of surface in	undation (	or soil satu	iration.	
	·		-	
Is the wetland hydrology criterion me	et? Yes_	<u> </u>	D	
Hallonale:Suface und	TTFS	aturat	at sol -	
JURISE	ICTIONA	L DETERI	MINATION AND RATIONALE	
Is the plant community a wetland?	Yes D	No		
Rationale for jurisdictional decision	VEAP	tation .	Flydrology putton: 1	ine wast. Produce Da
has the same soil as Su	mound	1 inere	low which dures have	-landaria Prativia
1		V	,	

<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

Station # 5

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD<sup>1</sup>

Field Investigator(s): Katherer Project/Site: Ovcutt Planning Applicant/Owner: Santa P Note: If a more detailed site des	Arca 22: Urcutt CK Arca 22: Urcutt CK artara Co. Plan cription is necessary, us	- <u>Hendrickan</u> Date: - State: CA County: nt Community #/Name: <u>Willow</u> se the back of data form or a fiel	Le [11] 95 Santa Barts O Ruperrain 5 Kapasan	iruts
Do normal environmental conditi Yes No (If no, exp Has the vegetation, soils, and/or Yes No (If yes, exp	ons exist at the plant co lain on back) hydrology been significa plain on back)	mmunity? antly disturbed?		
	VEGE	TATION	Indicator	
Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Status	Stratum
1. Salix lasiolepis	FACW TITE	11		
2		12		
3		13		
4		14		
D		15		
7		16		
8		17		
9		18		
10		19		
Is the hydrophytic vegetation cri Rationale:	terion met? Yes <u>&gt;</u>	_No	<u>.</u>	
	sc	DILS		
Series/phase:		Subgroup: <sup>2</sup>		
is the soil on the hydric soils list?	? Yes No	Undetermined	····	
Is the soil: Mottled? Vec	No Histic epip	pedon present? Yes No	D	
Matrix Color:		YesNo		
Other hydric soil indicators:	MOUIØ	Colors:		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Rationale: Not tested but	Yes No No	m + hydrology indicat	a this is	
werland.	• •			
	HYDR	OLOGY		
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Deoth to free-standing water in p	'YesNo No	<sup>2</sup> Surface water depth:		
List other field evidence of surface Deep creek channel	inundation or soil satu	iration. the steep verbral bank	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
ls the wetland hydrology criterion Rationale:	met? Yes <u>&gt;</u> N	0		
JUF		MINATION AND RATIONALE	•	

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes No\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_ Rationale for jurisdictional decision: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Willow Porcest fining Creek channel banks. Creek\_ had significant flow because no vegetation was present in the channel. <sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community

Assessment Procedure.

<sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

Station 40

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINA

Field Investigator(s): <u>Katherme</u> Project/Site: <u>Ortuit Mannue, Area</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Banta</u> <i>Note:</i> If a more detailed site descri	indlaule, E Staddictor Ma Count ption is nec	euth Cic By Plan essary, us	State: <u>UA</u> Da State: <u>UA</u> Co t Community #/Name: _ e the back of data form	D' unty: <u>Dan</u> <u>(Lpland</u> or a field not	195 ta Banbu (027644 18book.	117- (1-110)
Do normal environmental condition Yes <u>/</u> No (If no, explain Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy Yes _ <u>/</u> No (If yes, explain	s exist at th n on back) drology bee n on back)	θ plant cor en significa	nmunity?			
Dominant Plant Species         1	Indicator Status FACW FACU NI NI OBL, FA	VEGE	Dominant Plant Specie         11.         12.         13.         14.         15.         16.         17.         18.         19.         20.         pr FAC         3 <sup>7</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	35 	Indicator Status	
Series/phase:	<u>есье</u> Yes No No есте Эс	SO No Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle ( No	ILS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined edon present? Yes YesNo Colors:	No		
s the ground surface inundated? s the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/s List other field evidence of surface i <u>wewe</u> s the wetland hydrology criterion m Rationale:	Yes No oil probe ho nundation c et? Yes	HYDRC No of soil satur	DLOGY _ Surface water depth ration.			
JURIS	DICTIONAL	DETERM		NAIF		

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes No 200 Rationale for jurisdictional decision: One FACW, ONE FACK and 3 N South he with no such of intendential 5 won-wettowna inducator spo.

<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

ł

The second second

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD

Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Ba</u> Note: If a more detailed site des	cription is noce	Plan Plan Plan, us	State: <u>CA</u> t Community #/Na e the back of data	- County: <u>Sau</u> me: <u>Riverin</u> form or a field no	La Builbain	
Do normal environmental condition Yes No (If no, exp Has the vegetation, soils, and/or Yes No (If yes, exp	ons exist at the lain on back) hydrology bee lain on back)	plant com n significa	nmunity?			<u>-</u> -
	Indicator	VEGE	TATION			
Dominant Plant Species	Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant S	inacias	Indicator	Ohushu
1. <u>Salix lascolepis</u>	FACW	Tree.	11	100103		Stratum
23	<u> </u>		12			
4			13			
5			15			
7		·	16			
8			17 18			
9			19			
Percent of dominant			20			
Series/phase: <u>Rocer was</u> s the soil on the hydric soils list? s the soil a Histosol? Yes s the soil: Mottled? Yes	∽ Yes∕∕ NoH No(	SO No fistic epip Gleyed?	ILS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined edon present?Ye YesNo	d s No		
Other hydric soil indicators:		– Mottle (	Colors:	······		
s the hydric soil criterion met? Rationale: <u>het sampled</u> , hist of thatic Savis	YesN Rucr/ci;	lo <u></u> cek Ch	annel, Rur	wash soils e	on Nation	аQ
	1	HYDRC	LOGY			·
the ground surface inundated? the soil saturated? Yes <u>y</u> epth to free-standing water in pri- ist other field evidence of surface	Yes <u>9</u> No <u>9</u> Vsoil probe hole inundation or	No e: soil satu	_ Surface water c	lepth:		
s the wetland hydrology criterion lationale: Flowing 100	met? Yes)	No viel ch	anjel.			
JURI	SDICTIONAL	DETERM				
the plant community a worlda da	Vac V	No		,		
ationale for jurisdictional decision	n: <u>Cyeek</u>	chann	it with flow	ma water	& a few	individeals

1 > 5

æ

		i on back)	oignince	antly disturbed?		
Dominant Pla	nt Species	Indicator Status	VEGE	TATION	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. Lolium	multitlerum	HENEFAC	Harb	11		
102. Druba	is a qualitation	FAC.		12		
4. <u>Flym</u>	us htheordes	FACT		13		
5. <u>Rum</u>	ex CALSPUS	FACIU-	12	15		
6. Kumor	Salectolias	DBL FAR-		16		
1 8. Brom	us catharhous	NIJ		17		
V 9. Polypi	04.00 michopehensis	FACHT	11	19		
10		·		20		
Is the hydroph Rationale:	ytic vegetation criterio	on met? Frict	Yes X. Indis en	No OBL Sprink		
			so	ILS		
Series/phase:	ho hudein alle li 10			Subgroup: <sup>2</sup>		
Is the soil a Hi	stosol? Yes	Yes	No <u>^</u> Histic enir	Undetermined		
Is the soil: Mo	ittled? Yes	No 🔀	Gleyed?	Yes No	****	
Matrix Color: _	<u></u>		Mottle	Colors:		
Is the hydric so	oil criterion met? Ve	s I	No X			
Rationale	Low chroma	is press	ht but	- the mattles or could	ized inhuze	Solutions
nationale.	where also it	in this	area.			<u></u>
	UCTE COSEANED I					
\/	VETE COSLATER I		HYDRO	DLOGY		
ls the ground s	urface inundated?	ίes	HYDRC No _X	DLOGY Surface water depth:		
Is the ground s Is the soil satur	urface inundated? Yrated? Yes	íes NoX	HYDRO No <u>×</u>	DLOGY Surface water depth:		

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: Att on an very tanenst hydrology could support designation as welland, the hydrology is a result of very abon. Soll kest did not demonstrate <sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community reducing conditions Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD

Atation 407

in the second

RC	DUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup>		
field Investigator(s): Katherine	Rindlands, Betti Handrickson Date: (01)	95	
roject/Site: Craut Planning A	rea Site 22: Ovent Ct State: CA County: San	ita Bart	wara
pplicant/Owner: Dante Ba	vtsara Count Plant Community #/Name: _ Freshwad	er Mar	<u>51 / Repare</u>
<i>lote:</i> If a more detailed site descrip	ption is necessary, use the back of data form or a field note	book. =	Frapound
)o normal environmental condition 'esNo (If no, explain 'as the vegetation, soils, and/or hy 'esNo (If yes, explain	s exist at the plant community? n on back) rdrology been significantly disturbed? in on back)		·
	VEGETATION		•
Dominant Plant Species	Indicator	Indicator	Charathan
	Status Stratum Dominant Flant Species	Status	Stratum
1. CIEDEMONTS MACKESTROLUM	$\frac{OBL}{Herb} = 11.$		
2. <u>Reparticestumon acuahasa</u>	$\frac{OBL}{FAU2} = \frac{HAU}{T_{HAU}} = 12.$		
d	14		
5	15		
6	16,		
7	17		
8	18		
9	19		
10.	20		
Percent of dominant species that a	are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC(00%		
Bationale:	All Son EARLY FREE		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	SOUS		<u> </u>
Sarias(abasa)	Soles		
Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes No. Undetermined		····
Is the soil a Histosol? Yes	No Histic epipedon present? Yes No		
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes	No Gleved? Yes No	,	
Matrix Color:	Mottle Colors:		
Other hydric soil indicators:			
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y	(es No NOT TESTED		
Rationale:/All plant	NUBLOT FACIN		
	HYDROLOGY		
Is the ground surface inundated?	Yes X No Surface water depth:		
Is the soil saturated? Yes	No		
List other field evidence of surface	/soll probe hole:		
Is the wetland hydrology criterion r	met? Yes <u>&gt;&gt;&gt;</u> No		
Detionalat	1. All plants FACWORDBL		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Hallonale:	······································		
Hallonale:			
	SDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE		
JURI			
JURI JURI Is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision	SDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE           Yes         ½           No	-	·
Is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision	SDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE Yes No n: Mat OBL species, So it saturated.		

# DATA FORM

Atation #10

ROL	JTINE ON	SITE DET	ERMINATION METH	IOD <sup>1</sup>		
Field Investigator(s) Kathanana	walterito	BrHill	walnesson r	Deter lati	165	
Project/Site: Oral Plan. n Ang	Site 20:	Oraittel	Stata: (A		n Autor	
Applicant/Owner: Santa Barbo	ara Cori	TLY PLAN	Community #/Name	Fishering	IL DUAD	ana
Note: If a more detailed site descript	ion is nece	an (7 i lan	the back of data for	m or a field not	ebook	<u>10-</u>
Do normal environmental conditions	exist at the	ə plant cor	nmunity?			
YesNo (If no, explain	on back)		·			
Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hyd	rology bee	n significa	ntly disturbed?			
Yes <u>V</u> No (If yes, explain	on back)					
		VEGE	TATION			
Dominant Plant Spacing	Indicator	0.			Indicator	<b>O</b>
	Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Spe	CIES	Status	Stratum
1. Korippa nasturhom · aquineo,	MABL	Harlo	11			
2. Polypopor monspellieusis	FACUT	<u> </u>	12			
3. COPILE CORNep your	FACINE	11	13			
4	****		14		<u> </u>	
5		·····	15			
7	•		16		<u> </u>	
8			10		······································	
9	·		10			
10		<u> </u>	20			
Percent of dominant appoint that ar			The loop			
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criteric	e Obl, FA	Voc VI	No. 100-70			
Bationale: <u>All Spectes</u> and	untered	WW HA	Iac the noclo	are OBL	EN FAC	wŕ,
		<u> </u>				
		SC	ALS .			
Series/pnase:			Subgroup:4 -			
is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes	No	Undetermined	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Is the soil: Mottled? Ves	NO	Histic epi	Dedon present? Yes	No		
Matrix Color:	NO	Gieyed (	resNo			
Other hydric soil indicators - Satur	ratidu	rih hi	inconsul Side	5 mill	·····	·····
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye	s ×	No	1 1			
Rationale: Reducine enu	1 ironme	int is r	Sveisiont			
)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		HYDR	OLOGY			
le the annual surface to the test						
is the soil acturated?	Y 05		Surface water de	pth:		
Depth to free-standing water in pit/s	NO	- olo:				
list other field evidence of surface in	undation	or soil sat	iration			
Standing water Un of	Liber	hoof m	into.			
Is the wetland hydrolody criterion me	ət? Yes	XIN	0			
Rationale: Soil is pretural	ad i	with c	tanding water	T PLOSE to	Hec. Sterfe	rec.
	) `		)		U	
				1 - w 1 1/1 ba dan		
Is the plant community a wetland?	Yes 🖉	No_		ILL A Th	AL + A.	
Hauonale for jurisdictional decision:	-Jarv	Car t. a	- JOINT WELL L		cui spi	CC S

<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.
<sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

RO Field Investigator(s): <u>Kalturate f</u> Project/Site: <u>Creutt Planming Arc</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Bast a</u> <i>Note:</i> If a more detailed site descrip	UTINE ON Lundlain a Siti 20 ra Count tion is nece	DATA SITE DET <u>b</u> Bith <u>Over the Cic</u> <del>S</del> Plan essary, us	FORM ERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> Culturdanade som Date: <u>b</u> State: <u>C.A</u> County: <u>Saa</u> t Community #/Name: <u>Foregata</u> e the back of data form or a field n	ula 3 uta Buni: el exoplem otebook.	d the build you
Do normal environmental conditions Yes <u> </u>	exist at the on back) drology bee n on back)	e plant co en significa	nmunity? antly disturbed?		
		VEGE	TATION		
Dominant Plant Species         1.       Febbace public         2.       Lotium         3.       Curredan dashalar         4.       Triffedium reperso         5.       Lotius corniculario         6.	re OBL, FA	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species         11.         12.         13.         14.         15.         16.         17.         18.         19.         20.         Yor FAC         Øq %.         No	Indicator <u>Status</u> <u></u>	Stratum
Series/phase:		S	DILS		
Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes Is the soil: Mottled? Yes Matrix Color: V/R/ Other hydric soil indicators: Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: Parta is ivria Soils the support	Yes No 2 ass acts of bo	No Histic epi Gleyed? Mottle	Undetermined pedon present? Yes No Yes No X Colors: <i>Aric. Soil inducators fr</i> <i>Aric. Soil inducators fr</i>	und in 31	milar
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/s	Yes NoX soil probe f		Surface water depth:		
LIST OTHER TIER EVIDENCE OF SURFACE	inundation	or soil sat	uration.		
Is the wetland hydrology criterion m Rationale: <u>Hydrology</u>	iet? Yes is anti-ju		10 <u>P</u> - Surface, hot-grounde	CUTIN	
	DICTIONA	L DETER	MINATION AND RATIONALE		
JURIS					

		Miling th/2
RC Field Investigator(s): <u>Kalluruna</u> Project/Site: <u>Ovrait Plainny</u> Arc Applicant/Owner: <u>South Boat</u> Note: If a more detailed site descrip	DATA FORM UTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> <u>Conditants</u> , <u>Beth Handweitson</u> Date: <u>a Site 22:Ovail Ck</u> State: <u>CA</u> County: <u>I</u> <u>avr. County</u> Plant Community #/Name: <u>Julper</u> attion is necessary, use the back of data form or a fie	4/11/95 Santa Bailman Suced Grandend Id notebook.
Do normal environmental conditions Yes <u>X</u> No (If no, explair Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy Yes <u>X</u> No (If yes, explai	exist at the plant community? on back) drology been significantly disturbed? on back)	
Dominant Blant Service	VEGETATION	Indicator
1.       Faccoma menziesii         2.       Bromus dlandruo         3.       Bromus mollis         4.       Vilpia muuros         5.       Ifupachoens radicate         6.       Lupinus Namus         7.	Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species         FACW*       Shrub       11.          Hurb       12.         FRUM       Hurb       13.          Hurb       13.          Hurb       15.          Hurb       16.          18.          19.          20.         re OBL, FACW, and/or FAC       16.          19.	Status Stratum
Series/phase: <u>Advadus</u> , <u>Loo-</u> ls the soil on the hydric soils list? ls the soil a Histosol? Yes ls the soil: Mottled? Yes Matrix Color: <u></u> Other hydric soil indicators: <u></u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale:	SOILS  Yes No Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Yes No Undetermined No Histic epipedon present? Yes No No Gleyed? Yes No Mottle Colors: mome No No	o <u>\</u>
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/s	HYDROLOGY Yes No <u>`</u> Surface water depth: No oil probe hole:	
List other field evidence of surface i 	nundation or soil saturation. et? Yes No <u>b</u> ndwy watar	
JURIS s the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision: Does not support u	DICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE Yes No refland wagetation. Soils are la	orst, Gandy, dry
Assessment Procedure.	Hydric Soil Assessment Precedure and the Plant C	community

	Station #
DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> Field Investigator(s): <u>Kathurine Rindlaub</u> , <u>Beth Hendrickton</u> Date: <u>6/11/95</u> Project/Site: <u>Oventh Planning Area Site 22: Oventh Ctc</u> State: <u>CA</u> Deute: <u>Santa Barbara Country</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Barbara Country</u> Plant Community #/Name: <u>Dure Margin bern</u> Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.	ava Counter
Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community? Yes $\underline{\lambda^2}$ No (If no, explain on back) Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed? Yes No $\underline{\lambda}$ (If yes, explain on back)	
Werr       Dominant Plant Species       Indicator         96%       1.       Lolium multiflierum       IFAC       Ilurtifierum       Indicator         4%       2.       Juncus phaeocephalus       E4ew       11.       Image: Status       Status         4%       3.       Juncus phaeocephalus       E4ew       12.       Image: Status       Status         21%       3.       Juncus phaeocephalus       E4ew       12.       Image: Status       Image: Status <td< th=""><th>Stratum</th></td<>	Stratum
Soils         Series/phase:	
HYDROLOGY Is the ground surface inundated? Yes No Surface water depth:	5. D the flood plan throws, 1 the hell
Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _X No & May not be permanent, May not be permanent, Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _X No & M Rationale for jurisdictional decision: Soil's priteria not met. But Juncus phaeoeepha This data form and he is the cause of the seasonal nature of the hydrology	but senso nal, <u>but senso nal</u> , <u>but senso nal</u> , <u>mayo</u> <u>but</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>mayo</u> <u>ma</u>
Assessment Procedure.	ants are or FACW

Vernai Willands	Station + s
	***************************************
DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD	)1
Field Investigator(s): Katherine Kundlands, Beth Hendrickerson Dat	e:6 /u / 4 5
Applicant/Owner: Santa Baybara Country Plant Commission Cou	nty: Santa Barbara
Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form	<u>V APA L. U.Y. H. day, U</u>
YesNo $\underline{}$ (If no, explain on back)	
Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?	
100 (ii yes, explain on back)	
VEGETATION	
Dominant Plant Species Status Stratum Dominant Plant Specie	Indicator
olle 1. Guaphaliumpalustre FACW Herb 11_	
5% 2. Eleocharismacrostachup OBL 12.	
5% 3. Numex Salienolius OBL- 13.	
1 % 5. Vertiena bracteatz Facily 15	
6. Eleccharis accelling OBL J 16.	
7 17 17	
9 10.	
10 20 20	
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes No (126430) Rationale: <u>All dominants FACW or 0132</u> Enaphali	um is a vernel pool
SOILS	
Series/phase:Subgroup: <sup>2</sup>	
Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes No Undetermined	
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes No Gleved? Yes No	No
Matrix Color: Mottle Colors:	-
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes X No	
Rationale:AU plant sipp and either OF3L or F,	ACU)
HYDROLOGY	
Is the ground surface inundated? Yes No Surface water depth:	
Depth to free-standing water in oit/soil probe hole:	
List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.	
Is the wetland hydrolody criterion met? Yes X No	
Rationale: All plants are lither Oble or FACW. This	ral more bron showed
Extent of pending as mud flats around pernal per	al (impromoted)
JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIO	NALE
Is the plant community a wetland? Yes $\checkmark$ No	
Is the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No</u> No Rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Thus arrea is a versual</u> wet	and with vernal wetten
Is the plant community a wetland? Yes No No No Rationale for jurisdictional decision: This area is a very null wetta Species wetland species & about 1 This data form and species & about 1 This data form a	and with vernal wetten
Is the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No</u> <u>Rationale for jurisdictional decision</u> : <u>Thus area is a verifield wetrand specific of the Polyare wetland specific of the Polyare wetland specific of the Polyare Specific of the P</u>	land, unthe viernal wetten views signs of ponded wat

Field Investigator(s):       Kallborne:       Carlborne:       Challes:         Project/Site:       County:       South Discussion of the second	BC	DATA DUTINE ONSITE DE	FORM		
ProjectSite: Diruti Landow And Sitt 24, Circuit 12, State: Char.       Date:	Field Investigator(s). Katherine.	Randlands Boll	I ERMINATION METHOD		
Appligate/Owner:       Status Marcians, County Plant Community #Name: Tainstuced Excession, (Abasia, Mossie it a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.         Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?       Yes	Project/Site: Orcutt Plainping Area	Site 22, Orcutt CK	- State: CA County Son	1195	
Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?         Yes       No       (If no. explain on back)         Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?       Indicator         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         1       Lollur multifierum, Rec*       WEGETATION       Indicator         2       Society       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status         1       Lollur multifierum, Rec*       Horks       11.	Applicant/Owner: Santa Marko	ara County Pla	nt Community #/Name: In hodice	Crassland Coastal	
Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community? Yes		ption is necessary, u	se the back of data form or a field no	otebook.	
198	Do normal environmental conditions	s exist at the plant co	ommunity?		
Yes       No       No       VEGETATION       Indicator         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status         1       Loturn multifierum       Rock       Herb       11.	Has the vegetation soils and/or by	n on back)			
VEGETATION       Indicator         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         1.       Loluum multiPliorum, Enerthers       Enerthers       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         2.       Tesocoma mensues:       Enerthers       Enerthers       Status       Stratum         3.       Amatomica namus       Enerthers       14.       Enerthers       Enerthers         4.       Human and Mark       Enerthers       13.       Enerthers       Enerthers         6.       Hemanana mensues       Hards       16.       Enerthers       Enerthers         7.       .       Status       Stratum       20.       Enerthers       Stratus       Stratus         9.       .	Yes No $\underline{\bigcirc}$ (If yes, explai	n on back)	antly disturbed?	•	
VEGETATION       Indicator         Indicator         Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species         Status       Stratum       Indicator         Status       Stratum       Stratum         Status       Stratum       Stratus         Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus         Stratus       Stratus       Stratus         Stratus       Stratus       Stratus         Stratus       Stratus       Stratus         Stratus       Stratus <td colspa="2" s<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td>	<td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         1.       Laluar multifierum       Eduard       Ucros       11.       Status       Stratum         2.       Tescena menzytesit       Eduard       Durates       11.       Status       Stratum         3.       Aminomata psilosladuru       Eduard       Durates       12.       Status       Stratum         4.       Leptonus name       Eduard       Durates       14.       Status       Stratum         5.       Eduards name       Burates       14.       Status       Stratum       Stratum         6.       Herns name       Burates       14.       Status       Stratus       Stratus         7.       10.       Burates       Nates       50%       Hurle 98%       Attra Stratus         9.       10.       20.       20.       Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC Struktes 50%, Ukrle 98%, Attra 96%, Attra 96%, Attra 96%, Attra 96%, Attra 96%, Stratus       Status       Stratus       Stratus         10.       20.       Status       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       S		VEGE	ETATION		
1.       Low multiflorum       FRCM       Herks       11.	Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status Stratum	
2 <u>Assoceme mengesic</u> Back Struts       12.         3. <u>Assoceme mengesic</u> <u>Mack</u> Harls       13.         4. <u>Labornas psilosladure</u> <u>Barub</u> 14.         5. <u>Baccharis psilosladure</u> <u>Barub</u> 15.         6. <u>Hermanna</u> <u>Hermanna</u> <u>Hermanna</u> 7.       16.	1. Lolium multiflorum	FACH Herb	11		
3. <u>Amenasta psilosladur</u> <u>Herbs</u> 13. <u>Herbs</u> 13. <u>Herbs</u> 14. <u>Herbs</u> 14. <u>Herbs</u> 14. <u>Herbs</u> 14. <u>Herbs</u> 15. <u>Hermannan</u> <u>Herbs</u> 16. <u>IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII</u>	2. I Socoma manziesi	EACU + Shruck	2 12		
4.       Edepticate natures	3. Atmbrosia psiloslachyn	FAC Herb	13		
3.       Accession predicts	4. <u>Eupinus nanus</u>	- Herb	_ 14		
7.	6. Hemizonia incitiscens		2 15		
8.	7		17	-	
9	8		18		
10.	9		19		
Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC Strub 50%, Hurb 98%, All 98% 's Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes <u>int</u> No <u>X</u> Rationale: <u>All Humsch</u> Chevro f FC species to highly, other associated excloses <u>are upland</u> . <u>In addition</u> <u>holicom</u> <u>characternisheally mores</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>uctification</u> <u>process</u> into accas normally <u>attornaled</u> by upland grastes in <u>undertained</u> <u>process</u> <u>no</u> <u>solies</u> phase: <u>hoose</u> , <u>sandy</u> , <u>dry</u> <u>Subgroup</u> ? <u>is the soil on the hydric soils list</u> ? Yes <u>No X</u> <u>Undetermined</u> <u>solies drift</u> by <u>No X</u> <u>Mittle</u> Colors: <u>No Matrix</u> <u>off</u> <u>nodect</u> <u>process</u> <u>model</u> <u>attornale</u> : <u>Boil weshet fested at Hical loca bern</u> . <u>Non wetland indicators</u> <u>species</u> <u>attornale</u> ? Yes <u>No X</u> <u>attornale</u> ? Yes <u>No X</u> <u>attornale</u> <u>No indicators</u> <u>no X</u> <u>attornale</u> <u>No indicators</u> <u>no X</u> <u>attornale</u> <u>No indicators</u> <u>that thice</u> area was <u>numdated</u> or flooded. <u>JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE</u> <u>it the plant community a wetland</u> ? Yes <u>No X</u> <u>attornale</u> <u>no va</u> <u>attornale</u> <u>indicators</u> <u>Matrix</u> <u>no va</u> <u>attornale</u> <u>indicators</u> <u>hechology</u> <u>and</u> <u>upland</u> <u>planta</u> <u>among thechology</u> <u>attornale</u> <u>planta</u> <u>among thechology</u>	10		_ 20		
In the hydrophytic Vegetation criterion met? Yes       Matrix no       Move precises to human of the species of human of the massociuted species         are upland       In addition       holivin characteristically moves into an associuted species         are upland       In addition       holivin characteristically moves into an associuted species         stationale:       holivin characteristically moves into an associuted species         Series/phase:       holivin characteristically moves into an associuted species         Series/phase:       holivin characteristical proves into an associuted species         Series/phase:       No       X         Is the soil on the hydric soil indicators:       Molter Colors:       No         Other hydric soil indicators:       Molter Colors:       No         Other hydric soil indicators:       Soil wissing tested at the coloraborn. Nen wetland indicator species         Bationale:       Soil wissing tested at the coloraborn.       Nen wetland indicator species         s the ground surface inundated?       Yes	Percent of dominant species that a	re OBL, FACW, and	10r FAC Strubs 50%, Horb 98	1%, All 98% r	
are upland       The addition       below characteristicating movies into associated epicies         armunated by upland grasses in were data purchas betty movies into associated epicies       Solls         Series/phase:	Rationale: Although Const	ion met? Yes MA	No/		
dominated by upland grastes in wet was puckas files into available of solid s	are upland. In ada	tition, holivin	es is negro, otherassoci	itz il species	
Soils       Soils         Series/phase:       h005, 5andy, dny       Subgroup:2         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes       No       Undetermined         Is the soil a Histosol? Yes       No       X       Histic epipedon present? Yes       No         Is the soil indicators:	dominated by uplar	ad grasses in w	et years puchas their me	the areas nor mally	
S the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes	Series/phase hoose, Sam	fu diais	JILS	~	
Is the soil a Histosol? Yes No X Histic epipedon present? Yes No No Matrix Color: No Mottled? Yes No Gleyed? Yes No Matrix Color: No Matrix Color: No Mottle Colors: No Matrix Color: No Matrix Color: No Mottle Colors: No Matrix Color: No Matrix color indicators: No Matrix Color:	Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes No. 1	Subgroup:2	······································	
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes No <u>Max</u> Gleyed? Yes No Matrix Color: Mottle Colors: Mottle Colors: Is the hydric soil indicators: Mo Rationale: Soil with net? Yes No Rationale: Soil with net? Yes No mathematication met? Yes No Surface water depth: s the ground surface inundated? Yes No Surface water depth: s the soil saturated? Yes No Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: ist other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No _X lationale: No Mo JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE the plant community a wetland? Yes No ationale for jurisdictional decision: Hydrology_ and upland plants among the hole	Is the soil a Histosol? Yes	No X Histic en	Condetermined		
Matrix Color: Mottle Colors: Other hydric soil indicators: No	Is the soil: Mottled? Yes	No 1/2 Gleyed?	Yes No		
Indicators:       No         Is the hydric soil criterion met?       Yes       No         Rationale:       Soil wiss net tested at this loca box. Non wetland inducator species         Grid No OBL species.       HYDROLOGY         s the ground surface inundated?       Yes       No X         Surface water depth:       Surface water depth:       Surface water depth:         S the soil saturated?       Yes       No X         Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole:       Surface inundation or soil saturation.         Ist other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.       No X         s the wetland hydrology criterion met?       Yes       No X         Identified evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.       Surface water uses inundated or flooded.         JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE       Indicator flooded.         It he plant community a wetland?       Yes       No X         ationale for jurisdictional decision:       Hydrology and upland plants among the Loluent.	Matrix Color:	Mottle	Colors:		
Rationale: <u>Soil wish het tested at this locabon</u> . Non wetland indicator species <u>Grid wo OBi species</u> . HYDROLOGY s the ground surface inundated? Yes <u>No ×</u> Surface water depth: <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>No ×</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>Surface water field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation</u> . S the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes <u>No ×</u> Rationale: <u>No Indication that this area was inundated or flooded</u> . <u>JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE</u> I the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No ×</u> ationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Hydrology</u> and upland plants among the hole.	Is the hydric soil criterion met?				
Grid vo OBL species.         HYDROLOGY         s the ground surface inundated? Yes No X Surface water depth:         S the soil saturated? Yes No X         Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole:	Rationale: <u>Soil who hat</u>	tested at Un	- Non without	6	
HYDROLOGY         S the ground surface inundated? Yes No X Surface water depth:         S the soil saturated? Yes No X         Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole:	and no OBL speci	ves.	<u> </u>	I Malcaror greacs	
s the ground surface inundated? Yes No X Surface water depth: s the soil saturated? Yes No X Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: ist other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No X Rationale: No Indication that this area was inundated or finaded. JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE is the plant community a wetland? Yes No X ationale for jurisdictional decision: Mydrology and uplants among the Lolumn	· · ·	HYDR	OLOGY		
s the soil saturated? Yes No <u>x</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: ist other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No <u>x</u> Rationale: <u>No Indication that this area was inundated or flooded</u> . JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes No <u>x</u> ationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Hydrology</u> and upland plants among the Lolum	is the ground surface inundated?	YesNo 🔀	Surface water depth:		
JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes No X ationale for jurisdictional decision:	s the soil saturated? Yes	No <u>×</u>			
Sthe wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No X Rationale: <u>No Indication that this area was inundated or finaded</u> . JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE is the plant community a wetland? Yes No <u>X</u> ationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Hydrology</u> and upland plants among the Lolum	Depth to free-standing water in pit/s	oil probe hole:			
s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes <u>No X</u> Rationale: <u>No Indication that this area was inuindated or flooded</u> . JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE is the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No X</u> rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Hydrology</u> and upland plants among the Lolum.		nundation or soil sat	uration.		
JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE the plant community a wetland? Yes No 2 ationale for jurisdictional decision: _Hydrology_ and upland plants among the Lolum	Is the wetland hydrology criterion m	et? Yes N			
JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE the plant community a wetland? Yes No ationale for jurisdictional decision: Upland plants among the Lolum	Rationale: No Indication	re that this (	trea was inundated or	rflooded.	
JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE the plant community a wetland? Yes No 2 ationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Hydrology</u> and upland plants among the Lolum					
ationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Hydrology</u> and upland plants among the Lolum.		DICTIONAL DETER	MINATION AND RATIONALE		
anonale for jurisdictional decision: Hydroslogy and upland plants among the Lolivin.	JURISI	-			
	JURIS) s the plant community a wetland?	Yes No_2		<b>.</b>	

DATA FORM         ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD1         Field Investigator(s): Kallaute, Bark Lender, Applicat/Site: County: Calutte Determined: Applicat/Site: County: Calutte Determined: Applicat/Site: County: Calutte Determined: Applicat/Site: County: Calutte Determined: Calutte Determined: County: Calutte Determined: Calutte Deter			Station &
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD1         Field Investigator(s): Kallum: Activities, Statuling, Kartiget, Kallung, Ka	_	DATA FORM	
Field Investigator(s): Katharia Kuntlaub, Oxfa, thubuckom       Date:	R	OUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD	
Projection Solution Arrs, Sub 22 orrent of a State:       2.4.0.       2010.       2010.       2010.         Application Solution:       Souths To Souths a Counter       Plant Community #Name:       Souths To Autobar Counter       Souths To Autobar Counter         McTo::       If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field netabook.         Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?       Yes >> No	Field Investigator(s): Katherine	Roudlayb, Bett Hendrickson Date	lulac
Application Winer:       Description       Plant Community #Name:       Description         De normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?       Plant community?         Has the vegetation coils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?       No       (If no, explain on back)         Has the vegetation, coils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?       Indicator       Indicator         Yes       No       (If yes, explain on back)       Indicator         Dominant Plant Species       Disture       Status       Stratum         2.       Convex purgets       CBC       Added to the plant Species       Status         3.       Convex purgets       CBC       Added to the plant Species       Status       Stratum         3.       Convex purgets       CBC       Added to the plant Species       Status       Stratus         4.       Febugets an monspectrons)'s EAdeut       14.       Second       Second       Second       Second         5.       Extense Conspects       EAdeut       15.       Second	Project/Site: Orcut Plaining Arr	K, Site 22: Ovent ck. State: PA County: 2	2/11/45
De normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?         De normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?         Yes       No       (fin explain on back)         Dominant Plant Species       Indicator         Ves       No       (fin explain on back)         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         1       Lotus curruculatus       FAC         2       Scill Lakoncepta       FACM         3       Generous curruculatus       FAC         4       Webuscematications in Eduart       14         5       Currue environmental contensions       FAC         6       11       15         7       16       11         9       19       12         9       19       12         10       19       12         9       19       12         10       Solits       Solits         11       Solits       Solits         12       Solits       Solits         13       Solits       Solits         14       Solits       Solits         15       FACUrus (Marcurus (M	Applicativowner: <u>Savera Isave</u>	Dava County Plant Community #/Name:	COMMA DAYDAAA
Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?         Yes       No       (ff no, explain on back)         He vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?       Indicator         Yes       No       (ff yes, explain on back)         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         2. Softrateordrepro:       FAGU       Hords       11.         2. Softrateordrepro:       FAGU       Words       11.         3. Softrateordrepro:       FAGU       Words       11.         3. Softrateordrepro:       FAGU       14.		iption is necessary, use the back of data form or a field	notebook.
Yes       No       (If no, explain on back)         Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?       Yes       No       (If yes, explain on back)         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Indicator       Indicator         1       Leftws cornected and the control of the control o	Do normal environmental condition		
Has the vegetation, solis, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?         Yes       No       Indicator         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species         1       Loftus connection       FAC       Mode       Indicator         2       Scale Net and reprint Plant Species       Status       Stratum         3       Generation       FAC       Mode       Indicator         4       Pelegenon managelinesis       FAC       Mode       Indicator         5       Generation       FAC       Mode       Indicator         6       16       13	Yes <u>No</u> (If no, explained	in on back)	
Yes       No       No       Indicator         Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status         1.       Lotxo corraceutatus       EAC       Hode 11.       Status       Stratum         2.       Gatins taxingers       EAGU       Hode 11.       Status       Stratum         3.       Gatins taxingers       EAGU       Horis 13.       Stratum       Stratus         4.       Telepenson menapplinners       EAGU       14.       Stratus       Stratus         5.       Edumes       EAGU       15.       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus         9.       18.       19.       19.       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus         9.       10.       20.       Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC       100%       Stratus       Stratus         9.       11.       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus         9.       10.       20.       Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC       100%       Stratus       Stratus         10.       20.       No       Undetermined       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus       Stratus	Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy	/drology been significantly disturbed?	
Dominant Plant Species       Indicator       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratus         2.       Contration clepts       FARW       Montel function       The status       Stratus       Stratus         3.       Contration clepts       FARW       Montel function       The status       Stratus       Stratus         3.       Contration clepts       FARW       Montel function       The stratus       Stratus       Stratus         3.       Contration clepts       FARW       Montel function       The stratus       Stratus       Stratus         3.       Contration clepts       FARW       Montel function       The stratus	Yes No (If yes, expla	in on back)	
Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status         1.       Lohas corneculatures       EAC       Indicator         2.       Sativitaria       EAC       Indicator         3.       Sativitaria       EAC       Indicator         3.       Sativitaria       EAC       Indicator         3.       Sativitaria       OBL       Indicator         4.       Telepartic       Indicator       Indicator         5.       Chunez encous       Indicator       Indicator         6.       Indicator       Indicator       Indicator         7.       Indicator       Indicator       Indicator         9.       Indicator       Indicator       Indicator         9.       Indicator       Sold       Indicator         9.       Indicator       Sold       Indicator			
Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum       Dominant Plant Species       Status       Stratum         1.       Lotws corraceulatus       EAC       Horks       11.       Status       Stratum         2.       Calific taxo elegis       EAC       Horks       11.       Status       Stratum         3.       Calific taxo elegis       EAC       Horks       13.       Status       Stratum         4.       Felspecison mengizitmes       EAC       Horks       13.       Status       Stratum         6.		VEGETATION	
1.       Lotas corruculatus       EAC       Horts       Status       Status       Status         2.       Satustariotepus       EACU       Horts       11.       Image: Status	Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratum Dominant Plant Species	Indicator
2.       Sectivitation of the section of the sectin of the section of the section of the section of the section of t	1. Lotus corniculatus	FAC ilisto it	Status Stratum
3. <u>Derrows purgens</u> OB. Hork 13	2. Balixlasiolepis	FACW Sweets Tag	
4 <u>Felepergen meniopelinesis FACUT</u> 5. <u>Cuthex enspus</u> FACUT  5. <u>Cuthex enspus</u> FACUT  5. <u>Cuthex enspus</u> FACUT  5. <u>16</u> 5. <u>15</u> 6. <u>15</u> 7. <u>16</u> 7. <u>16</u> 7. <u>17</u> 8. <u>17</u> 8. <u>17</u> 8. <u>17</u> 8. <u>18</u> 9. <u>19</u> 10. <u>20</u> 9.	3. Scippus purgens	OBL Horb 13	
b.	4. <u>Folyponnonspeliens</u>	15 <u>FACUT</u> 14.	
0.       16.         7.       17.         8.       17.         9.       18.         9.       19.         10.       20.         Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC       100%         Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes       No         Rationale:       All Spectres are OBL or FACW         Series/phase:       Current of Core         Series/phase:       Matrix Core         St he soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes         No       Histic epipedon present? Yes         Matrix Color:       Modelermined         St he soil and Histosol? Yes       No         Gleyed? Yes       No         Other hydric soil indicators:       Mottle Colors:         St he hydric soil indicators:       Mottle Colors:         Other hydric soil criterion met? Yes       No         Rationale:       Thu is a annully so and of the loce of the Waard of the loce of loce	5. <u>Juinex Crispus</u>	FACW' 15	
8.	7	16	
9	8	17	
10	9	18	
Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC	10	19	
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes No No	Percent of dominant species that ;	are OBL EACING and/or EAC LOOD	
Hationale:       All Spectres are Oblear Each         Series/phase:       Reverse         Series/phase:       Reverse         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes         Is the soil a Histosol? Yes       No         Undetermined       No         St he soil a Histosol? Yes       No         Undetermined       No         St he soil a Histosol? Yes       No         Gleyed? Yes       No         Matrix Color:       Mottle Colors:         Other hydric soil indicators:       Mottle Colors:         St he hydric soil criterion met? Yes       No         Rationale:       Thin in?         Channel       Sonder for the thread process of the main Greek channel. All souch much the for the thread process of the main Greek channel.         Matrix Color:       Thin in?         On bans and the fore of the thread process of the main Greek channel.         Annel is a annually an anadol of vegeta han Efecult and the fore of the thread process of the thread process of the main of the fore of the thread process of the thread process of the main of the fore of the thread process of the thread proces of the thread proces of the thread process of the thread process	Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter	ion met? Yes $\checkmark$ No	
Soils       Soils         Series/phase:       Rurwach       Subgroup:2         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes       No       Undetermined         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes       No       Undetermined         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes       No       Undetermined         Is the soil and Histosol? Yes       No       Gleyed? Yes       No         Matrix Color:       Mottle Colors:       No         Other hydric soil indicators:       Mottle Colors:       Mottle Colors:         St the soil criterion met?       Yes       No         Rationale:       Thur is       Chernel on the hydric soil criterion met?         Other hydric soil criterion met?       Yes       No         Rationale:       Thur is chernel on the hydric soil criterion met?       Yes         On bars and the lot of Hytherel       Muttack       HTDROLOGY         s the ground surface inundated?       Yes       No       Surface water depth:	Rationale:Allsp	PRIES AND OBL OF FAC.W	
Series/phase:       Currwark       SUBGROUP:2         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes       No       Undetermined         Is the soil a Histosol? Yes       No       Histic epipedon present? Yes       No         Is the soil: Mottled? Yes       No       Gleyed? Yes       No         Matrix Color:       Mo       Gleyed? Yes       No         Other hydric soil indicators:       Mottle Colors:       Mottle         Other hydric soil criterion met? Yes       No       Matrix Creek charter(). Although much Hu         Chartel is annually and the bet of Hustmale       Matrix Creek charter(). Although much Hu         Chartel is annually and the bet of Hustmale       FACU)H (BBL epices dream         St he ground surface inundated? Yes       No         St he soil saturated? Yes       No         Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole:			
Schedynase:       Subgroup:2         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes       No       Undetermined         Is the soil a Histosol? Yes       No       Histic epipedon present? Yes       No         Is the soil a Histosol? Yes       No       Gleyed? Yes       No         Matrix Color:	Sariastah Ruthan	SOILS	
Is the soil of the hydric soils ist? Yes No	Is the soil on the huddin it is the	Subgroup: <sup>2</sup>	
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes No No Histic epipedon present? Yes No Matrix Color: Mo Mottle Colors: Other hydric soil indicators: Mottle Colors: Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes No Rationale: Thin is covered for weight chan Etcult (OBL species draw	Is the soil a Histosol? Yes	Yes <u>&gt;</u> No Undetermined	
Matrix Color: Motelle Colors: Motelle Colors: Other hydric soil indicators: Motelle Colors: Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes No Rationale: This is covered for vegeta have FACWH OBL species decay on bars and the lot of the transformed for vegeta have FACWH OBL species decay on bars and the lot of the transformed for vegeta have FACWH OBL species decay on bars and the lot of the transformed for vegeta have FACWH OBL species decay on bars and the lot of the transformed for vegeta have FACWH OBL species decay s the ground surface inundated? Yes No S the soil saturated? Yes No Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: .ist other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No Rationale: Creek_ from circulars eather conthe Surface or sufficiently close	Is the soil: Mottled? Yes	No Histic epipedon present? Yes No _	
Other hydric soil indicators:	Matrix Color:	Mottle Colors:	
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes No_ Rationale:This is come in the main creek channel. Although nicehold the Channel is annually on our ed of vegetation EACULE OBL species draw m bars and the lost of the bard of vegetation EACULE OBL species draw HYDROLOGY s the ground surface inundated? Yes No S the soil saturated? Yes No Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No Rationale: Creek_ flow circument entities on the Surface or Sufficiently close JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes No lationale for jurisdictional decision: No lationale for jurisdictional decision: No way tation in FACW and BBL Soil is on hydrice beits light.	Other hydric soil indicators:		
Halionale: this is comed of the main creek channel. Although ninch the Channel is annually as our ed of vegetation Efcult OBL operior draw m bars and the tot of the barlet Hydrology is the ground surface inundated? Yes No Surface water depth: Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: .ist other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No Rationale: Creek flow cortunies either on the surface or sufficiently close ho the surface to support OBL and FACW percented 3 JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes No lationale for jurisdictional decision: Creek flow for most of the man. Persistent No Lationale for jurisdictional decision: Creek flow for most of the man. Persistent No 	Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y	es No	
Contentine to another be of the part of begets han EACUH OBL species deciming on bars and the lot of the part of HYDROLOGY Is the ground surface inundated? Yes No Surface water depth: So the soil saturated? Yes No Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. So the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No Rationale: Creek_ flow circulars entities on the surface or sufficiently close No the surface to support OBL and FACW perenneals JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE So the plant community a wetland? Yes No tationale for jurisdictional decision: No tationale for jurisdictional decision: No Lationale for jurisdictional decision: No Lationale for jurisdictional decision: No Lationale for jurisdictional decision: No No Lationale for jurisdictional decision: No No No		The main creek channel. Althou	at niceh of Hu
Is the ground surface inundated? Yes No Surface water depth: Is the soil saturated? Yes No Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No Rationale: Creele_ flow corretinees either on the surface or sufficiently close to the surface to support OBL and FACW performula 3 JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes No tationale for jurisdictional decision: Creele_flow for most of the mean. Pensistent regulation in FACW and CBL Soil is on hydrice beits list.	on basis and U	Lally an owned of vegetation Efcult R	TBL Species DECIM
s the ground surface inundated? Yes No		HYDROLOGY	
S the soil saturated? Yes No Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: ist other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No Rationale: Creeke_ func circuman entities entities surface or sufficiently clear to the surface to support OBL and FACW performed 3 JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes No lationale for jurisdictional decision: Creeke flow for most of the year. Persistent regulation in FACW and CBL Soil is on hydrice beits light.	s the ground surface inundated?	Yes <u>No</u> Surface water depth:	
List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes <u>No</u> Rationale: <u>Creek function continues either on the surface or sufficiently close</u> to the surface to support OBL and FACW perenneals JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No</u> Rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Creek flow for most of the year. Persistent</u> regulation is FACW and CBL. Soil is on hydrice beits flort.	s the soil saturated? Yes	No	
s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No_ Pationale: <u>Creek flow continues either on the surplice or sufficiently close</u> to the surface to support OBL and FACW perconnels JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE s the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No</u> lationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Creek flow for most of the mean.</u> <u>Persistent</u> <u>regulation</u> is FACW and OBL. Soil is on hydrice beits flor.	ist other field evidence of evidence	soil probe hole:	
s the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No_ Pationale: <u>Creek func circumens entern on the surface or sufficiently close</u> to the surface to support OBL and FACW performed 3 JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE 3 the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No</u> No_ No_ Nationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Creek flow for most of the year</u> . <u>Persistent</u> 		inundation or soil saturation.	
Rationale: <u>Creek functionics either on the surplice or sufficiently close</u> to the surface to support OBL and FACW perenneals JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE 3 the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No</u> Rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Creek flow for most of the year</u> . <u>Persistent</u> regulation is FACW and OBL. Soil is on highrice beits list.	s the wetland hydrology criterion m	let? Yes 🖉 No	<u> </u>
To the Surface to Support OBL and FACW perennels JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE 3 the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>No</u> Rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Creek flow for most of the year</u> , <u>Pensistent</u> 	Rationalo: _ Creek Mow CI	Netinicas entrur on the surplice or	Suldanon OD alese
JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE 3 the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>V</u> No	to the surface to suppor	+ OBL and FACW perennels	Supportences and
s the plant community a wetland? Yes No No lationale for jurisdictional decision: Creek from for most of the year. Persistent regulation is FACW and ask. Soil is on hydrice beits list.	JURIS	DICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONAL F	
Rationale for jurisdictional decision: No for most of the year, Pensistent vegetation: us FACW and OBL. Soil is on hydrice beits list.	s the plant community a wetland?	Von V	•
· ····································	Rationale for jurisdictional decision:	- Creek flow for most of the year,	Pensistent
This data form can be used for the Ukidi on the	This data form can be used for the	that a "	LLOT.
Assessment Procedure	Assessment Procedure	rivoric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Cor	nmunity

and the second second

DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> Field Investigator(s): <u>Katherinic Rindlaub</u> , <u>Beth Hendrickson</u> Date: Project/Site: <u>Orault Plannuic Area</u> , <u>Bete 22</u> , <u>Oraultek</u> State: <u>CA</u> County: <u>County</u> ApplicantOwner: <u>Quinta Bithibara County</u> Plant Community #/Name: <u>Futro</u> Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field	6/11/95 Danta Barbarr duced Annual Gravesland
Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community? Yes No (If no, explain on back) Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed? Yes No (If yes, explain on back)	· · ·
VEGETATION         Indicator         Port         1.       Erodium botrys         970       1.         Gromus duandniss         21       3.         Classing duandniss         21       4.         Vill prix       Manuss         21       5.         21       5.         21       6.         3.       Constant Plant Species         21       6.         3.       Constant Plant Species         21       6.         3.       Constant Plant	Indicator Status Stratum
Soils         Series/phase:       Subgroup:         Is the soil on the hydric soils list?       Yes       No       Vundetermined         Is the soil a Histosol?       Yes       No       X       Histic epipedon present?       Yes       No         Is the soil:       Mottled?       Yes       No       Gleyed?       Yes       No         Is the soil:       Mottled?       Yes       No       Mottle Colors:       No         Matrix Color:       Mottle colors:       Mottle Colors:       No       Yes       No         Is the hydric soil indicators:       No       X       No       Xettle Colors:         Is the hydric soil criterion met?       Yes       No       Xettle Colors:         Is the hydric soil criterion met?       Yes       No       Xettle Colors:         Is the hydric soil criterion met?       Yes       No       Xettle Colors:	
HYDROLOGY Is the ground surface inundated? Yes No Surface water depth: Is the soil saturated? Yes No Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes No Patienale.	
JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE Is the plant community a wetland? Yes No 2 Rationale for jurisdictional decision: No wetland plant species. Soil is 1	Dose, sandy dry.
<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Con Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."	mmunity

Station 17

5-1 : Upland

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD<sup>1</sup>

Station 18

Dominant Plant Species 1. Lolium mulhflorum 2. Distichtis spicate 3023. Hordeum marinum 2. Lohis corniculatus	VEGE Indicator Status FAC ? FAC ? FAC ?	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status Strati
Dominant Plant Species 1. Lolium mulhflorum 2. Districtus spicate 3023. Hordeum marinum 2. Lotus corniculatus	Status FAC ? <u>Hurb</u> <u>FAC</u>	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status Strati
<ul> <li>5. <u>Chancelum fuscation</u></li> <li>6</li> <li>7</li> <li>8</li> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>Percent of dominant species that a ls the hydrophytic vegetation criter</li> </ul>	IFAC	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
Series/phase: Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes Is the soil: Mottled? Yes Matrix Color:V R 4[3 Other hydric soil indicators: Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye	Yes No No No No Mo Mottle No Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo Mo	Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> ∠ Undetermined ipedon present? Yes No Yes No _∠ Colors: ipheres Soil is same	y
Rationale: No gley or 0x1			
Rationale: <u>No glaw for oxi</u> ls the ground surface inundated? ls the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/s List other field evidence of surface i	HYDR Yes No No coil probe hole: nundation or soil sat	OLOGY Surface water depth:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

<sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERM

Atation 19

Field Investigator(s): <u>Kathermer</u> Project/Site: <u>Creat Planning Arrass</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Crasty</u> Note: If a more detailed site descrip	indlants it 22 · Cr inca Can tion is nec	<u>AHL</u> <u>CLHCK</u> <u>AL</u> Plar ossary, us	ERMINATION MI <u>Conductors</u> State: <u>CA</u> it Community #/Na ite the back of data	ETHOD <sup>1</sup> Date: – County: _ ame: <u>Froti</u>	6/11/95 Santa Barto Water Uarge	2 <u>15 (47</u> 2)
Do normal environmental conditions Yes <u>2</u> No (If no, explain Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hyd Yes <u>2</u> No (If yes, explain	exist at th on back) Irology bee on back)	e plant co	mmunity? antly disturbed?			
	Indicator	VEGE	ΤΑΤΙΟΝ			
Dominant Plant Species	Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant S	Soacias	Indicator	Ctrature
1. Korppanasturtion agrication	M_OBL	Herb	11		Status	Stratum
2. Tayprecommonspeliensis	FACENT		12			
A RUMAN AUGODIA	FACUL	<u> </u>	13			
5. HENCEPHEND boulder notion	FACUT	h	14			
6. heymus tribeoides	FAC+	i	15			
7. Lolivin perenne	FAC		16			
8. testuca rubra	KAC_	4	18			·
9			19			
			20			
Series/phase: <u>either Riverwas</u> Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes I Is the soil: Mottled? Yes I Matrix Color: <u>57 511</u> Other hydric soil indicators: <u>©xid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes Rationale: <u>Low chrame</u>	Yes Yes No NO NO NO NO N	No X SO Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle f hizee No X	ILS Undetermine Wedon present? Yo Yes No Colors: Nerce & - arr Sherce & - arr Sherce & - arr Sherce & - arr	er (BL) 2 es No X Naerobic Color C		
Is the ground surface inundated? Y Is the soil saturated? Yes $\underline{\times}$ I Depth to free-standing water in pit/so List other field evidence of surface int	es <u>X</u> No il probe ho undation o	HYDRO No ble: r soil satu	DLOGY Surface water of ration.	depth: <u>ak</u>	surfrace (br.	9 <u>9 9</u> 7)
Is the wetland hydrology criterion met Rationale:	t? Yes_	<u> </u>	•			
JURISD		DETERN	INATION AND R	ATIONALE		
Is the plant community a wetland? Y Rationale for jurisdictional decision: \oweburgman the oxidized white	res X	No	Hig- FACLOOR C	BL- SOI	I surgars in	induted
This data form can be used for the H	lydric Soil	Assessme	ant Procedure and	the Plant Co	ommunity	

Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION M

Field Investigator(s): <u>Katheren</u> Project/Site: <u>Avcutt Planning &amp;</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Bart</u> Note: If a more detailed site descrip	<u>eava (ou</u> ption is nea	<u>and Brand B</u>	In Hondreck con       Date:	u/gS ita Baila ir Wict Mc tobook.	ava_ altru
Do normal environmental conditions Yes <u>— No _ /</u> (If no, explain Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy Yes _ <u>/</u> No _ // (If yes, explai	s exist at the n on back) drology bee n on back)	e plant con	mmunity?		
		VEGE	TATION		
Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator	<b>O</b> 1 1
1 Hordeum Mannium	FAC	Stratum III.		Status	Stratum
2. Lolium	FAC	HULL	12		
3. Distriktis spication	EXCU	-1	13		
4. Lotus corniculatus	EAC-	*	14		
5	·	<b></b>	15		
7	·········	<u> </u>	16		
8			17		
9			19		
10			20		
Rationale:	Yes No No No No NE_EA ~ es A O XIGI	SC No _X Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle n 1325 No z.dth	HLS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined  Pedon present? YesNo YesNo YesNo Colors:2.5 Y Colors:2.5 Y Colors:2.5 Y Present . Gleu uzg.spheres present		
		HYDRO	DLOGY	,	
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>y</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/s List other field evidence of surface i <u>Deep locations</u> with Is the wetland hydrology criterion m Rationale: <u>South</u> and	Yes <u>X</u> No noil probe ha nundation a standin et? Yes _ saturat	No or soil satu uratur No T_(1	Surface water depth:A <	junforce in	<u>→5</u> ×₩
		DETED			
s the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision:	Yes /	No	a while yate watand spice	ydrolne yen ave l	1. I asont-

nent Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD<sup>1</sup>

Station 21

(

Field Investigator(s): <u>KaHu Run</u> Project/Site: <u>Overthe West Flam</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Burbo</u> Note: If a more detailed site descrip	<u>dlaub</u> , <u>Beth</u> <u>wiz</u> <u>Aiza</u> , St. 2 vz. <u>County</u> ition is nocessar	<u>Hendvick son</u> Date: ZZ State: <u>CAUE</u> County: Plant Community #/Name: <u></u> v, use the back of data form or a fi	<u>b/11/95</u> Sautz Bavtritz <u>hivater iliansk</u> eki notebook.
Do normal environmental conditions Yes No _X (If no, explain Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hyd Yes No _X (If yes, explain	exist at the plan on back) drology been sig n on back)	t community? nificantly disturbed?	
	V ladicator	EGETATION	Indicator
Dominant Plant Species	Status Stra	tum Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratum
90 1. <u>Cotala coronopitetia</u> 98 2. <u>Ronpia nastuntum</u>	FACW+ Her OBL HU	b 11 -6 12 13	
4. Agroshis semmerheellaTa	- OBL Her	14	
% 5. Volypigon Monspellensis	FAC = Hc	río15 río16	
% 7. Juncus bufomius	FACWT HE	<u>-lo</u> 17	······································
8. Suprus cationuca	OBL HO	18 rb 19	
10		20	
Series/phase: <u>Stup Man (1672</u> Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes Is the soil: Mottled? Yes Matrix Color: Other hydric soil indicators: <u>h</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is Satura</u>	) indication Yes No No Hist No Gley Udvogen St (es No tick And	SOILS <u>Contaluts</u> Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> <u>A</u> o <u></u> Undetermined <u></u> c epipedon present? Yes <u></u> yed? Yes <u>No</u> <u>No</u> Nottle Colors: <u>No </u> <u>Inde</u> <u>Anatholic</u> <u>Understic black</u> FAC FRC W CY OBL	No
	Harris over	AYDROLOGY	
Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes X Depth to free-standing water in pit List other field evidence of surface	Yes X N No /soil probe hole: inundation or se	o Surface water depth:  pil saturation.	
ls the wetland hydrology criterion Rationale:	met? Yes X Salinated	No	· · ·
JURI Is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decisio Curved Sould Purit	Yes V Yes V m: <u>This we</u>	ETERMINATION AND RATIONA No Cand weets vegetation etlands- All spp Fac, F	LE. hydrology Acw or OBL
<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for th Assessment Procedure.	те Hydric Soil As	sessment Procedure and the Pla	nt Community

<sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

Unclett Creek-	Exchwater March to wet mandau
Deperstrand	Econocit

States 30

C.

RO	DATA UTINE ONSITE DE	FORM		
Field Investigator(s): Katha Ran	deaute Bith He	i-direction nate:	4/11/45	
Project/Site: Cruth Check Plan	UNIL AUGH SITE 22	State: CAL County: 5	ANTA BRACH	17
Applicant/Owner: The Billing of	Plar	nt Community #/Name: TIT \$151	200 Fitturi	+ to Wit- Mad
Do normal environmental conditions	exist at the plant co	mmunity?		
Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy	i on back) drology been signific	antly disturbed?		
Yes <u>X</u> No (If yes, explai	n on back)	5		
	Indicator	TATION	Indicator	
Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Status	Stratum
1. Districhtis spicetic	FACLO Herb	. 11		
2. Horacuum marinum	FACW'T II	12		· ····································
24. Lolivin multitorim	FAC? 11	_ 14		
%5. Lotus conneulations	FAR II	15		
7	<u>(ACU)</u>	_ 16		
8		_ 18	<u> </u>	
9	. <u> </u>	_ 19		
Percent of dominant species that a	are OBL EACW and	Vor FAC $INT$		
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter	ion met? Yes 🖌	No		
Rationale:All specific and a	FULISE FAC.			
	S	011 S		
Series/ohase:	ach	Subaroup: <sup>2</sup>		
Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes 🗡 No \_	Undetermined		
Is the soil a Histosol? Yes	No Histic ep	vipedon present? Yes No		
Matrix Color: 10 YR 3/1	Gieyeu /	= Colors: 10 YR 416		
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Gxi</u>	Hizel Vhizosph	eres IOYR 416		
	es X No	Black. And 2- with ox	Idized thez	15 Dalara
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Bationale: 그야비 이 것도				
Rationale: <u>Source</u> And motion				
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is gla</u> <u>Anich incttles</u>	HYDI	ROLOGY		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is gla</u> <u>And mottles</u> Is the ground surface inundated?	HYDI Yes No X	ROLOGY K Surface water depth:	<u> </u>	
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And methos</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in oit	HYDI Yes <u>No Xo</u> No	ROLOGY K Surface water depth:		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And mottles</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface	HYDI Yes No No soil probe hole: inundation or soil sa	ROLOGY  Surface water depth: turation.		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And InetHes</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface	HYDI Yes No No soil probe hole: inundation or soil sa	ROLOGY Surface water depth: .turation.		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And mottles</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface Is the wetland hydrology criterion r Rationale: <u>Soil is surfunction</u>	HYDI Yes No No soil probe hole: inundation or soil sa net? Yes	ROLOGY <u>    Surface water depth:</u> turation. No		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And mottles</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface Is the wetland hydrology criterion r Rationale: <u>Soil is surmation</u>	HYDI Yes No No soil probe hole: inundation or soil sa net? Yes	ROLOGY Surface water depth: turation.		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And mottles</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface Is the wetland hydrology criterion r Rationale: <u>Soil is surmation</u> JURIS	HYDI Yes No soil probe hole: inundation or soil sa net? Yes SDICTIONAL DETE	RMINATION AND RATIONALE		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And Inoffloo</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface Is the wetland hydrology criterion r Rationale: <u>Soil is surfuncted</u> JURIS Is the plant community a wetland?	HYDI Yes No No soil probe hole: inundation or soil sa net? Yes SDICTIONAL DETEI Yes No _	ROLOGY  Surface water depth:  turation.  No  RMINATION AND RATIONALE		
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y Rationale: <u>Soil is glas</u> <u>And mottles</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface Is the wetland hydrology criterion r Rationale: <u>Soil is submater</u> JURIS Is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision	HYDI Yes No No No soil probe hole: inundation or soil sa net? Yes X SDICTIONAL DETEI Yes No Hydru	RMINATION AND RATIONALE		

R	OUTINE ONSI	DATA TE DET	FORM	FTHOD <sup>1</sup>			
Field Investigator(s): K. Rundi	aut, B. He	utici/	him	- Date:	4/11/93		
Applicant/Owner: <u>Statut</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Statut</u>	17- C. CULILLY	– Plan	State: it Community #/Ni	_ County:_ ате:_ <u>И</u> Р	Santa Barly	JIT-	CILUMMA WART
Do normal environmental condition		sary, us 		a torm or a fi 	eld rlotebook'. 		
Yes <u>No</u> (If no, explain Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy Yes <u>No</u> (If yes, explain	in on back) /drology been in on back)	significa	antly disturbed?				
		VEGE					
Dominant Plant Species	Status S	tratum	Dominant Plant	Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	
1 2			11				
3			13				
4 5			14 15				
6 7	· <u></u> <u></u>		16				
8			17		· ·	•	
9	- <u> </u>		19 20				
Percent of dominant species that a	are OBL, FACV	V, and/c	or FAC				
Rationale:	ion met? Yes	s	_ No <u>, <u>*</u> </u>		,		
							(MARKA)
Series/phase: Currua	dr.	SO	ILS	2			
Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes 🖄 I	No	Subgroup: Undetermine	е эd			
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes	No <u> </u>	stic epip aved?	edon present? Y	esN	0	·	
Matrix Color: <u>/0 VR 3</u>	11 Ali	Mottle (	Colors: <u>3 10</u>	V. 2 14/6	6-100 2.5	black.	
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Y	es <u>V</u> No	2 <u>11</u> P-	untie 7 UNI	<u>uzui nu</u>	ige special		
Hationale: Alanzi -	20HLis & 1	2 11/2	al philosophie	62.1		<del>n</del> _	,
0	<u> </u>		DLOGY	<u></u>		<u></u>	
Is the ground surface inundated?	YesN	Vo <u>//</u>	Surface water	depth:			
Depth to free-standing water in pit/s	No oil probe hole:						
List other field evidence of surface i	nundation or s	oil satur	ration.				
ls the wetland hydrology criterion m Rationale:	et? Yes 🗡	2 <b>No</b>	)			······	
JURIS		ETEDRA			·····		
Is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision:	Yes Ki	No	EILE LIET				,
<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the	Hydric Soil As	<u>etty ji</u>	MUL) illipros	INDIAL (1)	Will mont	Huis is	due to
Assessment Procedure,		2022116	ALL TOCODULE AND	a ine Plant C	ommunity aunc みパ	45. rals	man 1
according to "Soll la	xonomy."				Burud	Districtus	1686 3
					found	if" dow	r.

ROUT Field Investigator(s): <u>K. Rundlau</u> Project/Site <u>Lur (1.111 – Planum) A</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Acuta Barlanum</u> Note: If a more detailed site descriptio	DATA FORM TINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> <u>is B. Howington</u> Date: <u>if [11]</u> <u>in Diccar</u> State: <u>IA</u> County: <u>it it</u> <u>in County</u> Plant Community #/Name: <u>Palication</u> on is necessary, use the back of data form or a field no	15 <u>R Ballara</u> ne Accp tebook.
Do normal environmental conditions ex Yes No (If no, explain or Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydro Yes No (If yes, explain o	xist at the plant community? n back) plogy been significantly disturbed? on back)	
Dominant Plant Species	VEGETATION         Indicator         Stratum Dominant Plant Species         FAC       11.         FAC       12.         FAC       13.         FAC       14.         FAC       15.         FAC       16.         ?       17.          18.          20.         OBL, FACW, and/or FAC         VEGETATION	Indicator Status Stratum
Series/phase: Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Y Is the soil a Histosol? Yes N Is the soil: Mottled? Yes <u>\$38</u> N Matrix Color: IO VR <u>312</u> Other hydric soil indicators: Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes Rationale:And J Soul Carrod chouse &	SOILS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> (esNoUndetermined NoHistic epipedon present? YesNo NoNoNo Mottle Colors:7.5 YR 4/4 - No No No No No No No No No No No No No No No No No No No 	oxidized interzopherics.
Is the ground surface inundated? Y Is the soil saturated? Yes X I Depth to free-standing water in pit/soi List other field evidence of surface in Satura Is the wetland hydrology criterion met Rationale:	HYDROLOGY es No X Surface water depth: No il probe hole: undation or soil saturation. trat & conclues depth in Ad trat & conclues depth in Ad	ndy soil-
JURISD Is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>مرکم مریم مرکم مرکم مرکم</u> <sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the H Assessment Procedure	ICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE Yes No All entries and methods All app overen Jouna in Datmated Scil. Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Com	FAC or FAC W

Atation 24

(

<sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

	DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> Field Investigator(s): <u>K. Cundunub, B. Handrubson</u> Date: <u>Chudon 645</u> Project/Site: <u>Chudon Plannua Avec Enté 22</u> State: <u>CHB</u> County: <u>Mantra Baul</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Pautra Baularra</u> , <u>An</u> Plant Community #/Name: <u>Uitt Madario</u> Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.	(Dubicus)
	Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community? YesNo (If no, explain on back) Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed? YesNo (If yes, explain on back)	
-70° 10 11	VEGETATION         Indicator         Indicator         Status       Status         Indicator         Indicator         Indicator         Indicator         Indicator         Indicator         Status         Indicator         Indite to multinit species         <th colspan="</th> <th><u>Stratum</u></th>	<u>Stratum</u>
	SOILS         Solution of the hydric soils list? Yes	c)
	List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. Soil is uset at surface	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

<sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

Field Investigator(s): <u>Katherun</u> Project/Site: <u>Creath Plannis Arc</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Santa Bast</u> Note: If a more detailed site descri	DUTINE ON Rindla A, Dite DD Zira Cour ption is nea	DATA SITE DET Lub, Beth Chartlet Chartet Plan assary, us	FORM ERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup> Literation Date: <u>1</u> State: <u>County:</u> t Community #/Name: <u>Intra</u> e the back of data form or a field	In GE Lanta Brinkara duced Errasiand I notebook.	
Do normal environmental condition Yes No _> (If no, explai Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy Yes No (If yes, expla	s exist at the n on back) drology bee in on back)	e plant com n significa	mmunity? antly disturbed?		
Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	VEGE Stratum	TATION  Dominant Plant Species  11.	Indicator Status Stratum	
2			12.         13.         14.         15.         16.		
10.         Percent of dominant species that			17.         18.         19.         20.		
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale:	ion met?	Yes	No		
Series/phase: <u>LOCSE450</u> Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes Is the soil: Mottled? Yes Matrix Color: <u> </u>	Ves No No No ionc es	No Histic epi Gleyed? Mottle No 2054	Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined pedon present? Yes No Yes No Colors: Sandy to 16 "		
ls the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes Depth to free-standing water in pit/ List other field evidence of surface	Yes No X soil probe h inundation	HYDR No <u>×</u> ole: or soil satu	OLOGY Surface water depth: http://www.uration.	z art 16"	
ls the wetland hydrology criterion n Rationale:	net? Yes_	N	o <u> </u>		
JURIS	DICTIONA		MINATION AND RATIONALE		×

POL	DATA FORM	
Field lavasticator(a) K & Hugyana (	<sup>2</sup> unditude Constitution Method	
Project/Site: Ov cut Planning April	Site 22: Orattele State: CA County 6	GINIGE Soute Readoance
Applicant/Owner: Santa Banta	a Country Plant Community #/Name: Frish	water marsh tributary
Note: If a more detailed site descript	lion is necessary, use the back of data form or a fie	d notebook. j
Do normal environmental conditions	exist at the plant community?	
Yes X No (If no, explain	on back)	
Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hyd	rology been significantly disturbed?	
	VEGETATION	
Dominant Plant Species	Indicator	Indicator
A ibordening values	FAC Us to the factor of the fa	Status Stratum
le 2. Lolium	FAC 12	
3. Eleochivis marvestachua	<u>OBL</u> 13.	
2 4. Cotula covenegoifelia	<u>FACW</u> <sup>†</sup> 14.	
7 6 Trifolium verence	FAC 15	
7		
8	18	
9	19	
Poreget of deminester in the second		
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterio	でOBL, FACW, and/or FAC <u>のつうゆうゆ, 45% c</u> i on met? Yes X No	cver
Rationale: MOST Species an	e FAC, however an obligate wet	land sprates
is included among	g them.	
$\leq$ $\circ$ $\circ$ $\circ$	SOILS	•
Series/phase: <u>Janky Soll</u>	Subgroup: <sup>2</sup>	
Is the soil on the hydric soils list?	Yes <u>          No            Undetermined</u>	-
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes	No Gleved? Yes X No	0
Matrix Color: <u>2,5 Y 3/1</u>	Mottle Colors:	
OU 1 11 11 11 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	e X No	
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxic</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye	3,	
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u><u>aleying</u> low di</u>	woma in matrix, presence of oxid	12ed vhizespheres
Other hydric soil indicators: Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale:leyinglow d	irona in matrix, presence of oxid	13ed thispspheres.
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>exit</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u><u>Aleying</u> low ch</u>	HYDROLOGY	ized thizospheres.
Other hydric soil indicators: Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale:leyinglow dt Is the ground surface inundated?	HYDROLOGY Yes & No X Surface water depth:	ized vhizospheres.
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u><u>Aleying</u> low di Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free standing water is side</u>	HYDROLOGY HYDROLOGY Yes <u>K</u> No <u>K</u> Surface water depth: <u>No</u>	13ed thispspheres.
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleying tow ch</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/su List other field evidence of surface in	HYDROLOGY Yes & No X Surface water depth: No poil probe hole: nundation or soil saturation.	13ed thizospheres.
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleqing</u> low de Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/s List other field evidence of surface in	HYDROLOGY HYDROLOGY Yes & No X Surface water depth: No oil probe hole: nundation or soil saturation.	13ed thispspheres.
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleqing</u> <u>low dr</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/se List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Bationals: <u>Small</u> durc vision	HYDROLOGY Yes & No Surface water depth: No oil probe hole: pundation or soil saturation. et? Yes _X No	13ed vhizospheres.
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleying tow di</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/su List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale: <u>Snall drainage</u> V on Crecke Hood plain. Toppon	HYDROLOGY HYDROLOGY Yes & No X Surface water depth: No oil probe hole: nundation or soil saturation. et? Yes X No (uns at an angle acrosspresetty to a Gaptus a paragraphic to a construct the	emerge unto weeden
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleying low di</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/su List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale: <u>Snall drainage</u> <u>on creck food plain</u> . To pay	HYDROLOGY HYDROLOGY Yes & No X Surface water depth: No oil probe hole: nundation or soil saturation. et? Yes X No (uns at an angle across property to a raphy appearse natural, although the	emerge into wet meadow b dramaje may reer uz runeth down a belf cou
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleying low dr</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/se List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale: <u>Small drainage</u> V <u>JURISE</u>	HYDROLOGY HYDROLOGY Yes <u>K</u> No <u>K</u> Surface water depth: <u>No</u> No <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>No</u> oil probe hole: <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>No</u> oil probe hole: <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>No</u> <u>No</u> <u>No</u> <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>No</u> <u>Surface water depth</u> : <u>No</u> <u>Curso ar an angle accoss property ho</u> <u>Curso ar an angle accoss property ho <u>Curso ar an angle accoss</u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u></u>	emerge into wet meadow o drama je may reer ve runofo from a golf crun 'to the south
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleying low ch</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/su List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale: <u>Snall dramage v</u> <u>On Crecle flood plain</u> . Topegy JURISI Is the plant community a wetland? Bationale for invided in the stand?	HYDROLOGY HYDROLOGY Yes & No Surface water depth: No oil probe hole: nundation or soil saturation. et? Yes _X No (uns at an angle across property to (uns at a angle across property to (uns at	emerge unto wet menden b drainage may reeding tunoff from a golf cours to the south
Other hydric soil indicators: <u>Oxid</u> Is the hydric soil criterion met? Ye Rationale: <u>Aleying low di</u> Is the ground surface inundated? Is the soil saturated? Yes <u>X</u> Depth to free-standing water in pit/su List other field evidence of surface in Is the wetland hydrology criterion me Rationale: <u>Snall drainage v</u> <u>On Crecle flood plain</u> . Topogy JURISI Is the plant community a wetland? Rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>one coble ate</u> Species.	HYDROLOGY HYDROLOGY Yes NO Surface water depth: No oil probe hole: nundation or soil saturation. et? Yes _X No (uns at an angle acrossproperty to a (uns at a angle acrossproperty to	emarge into wet maden o drainage may receive runofo from a golf cours the south

Station #28

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD<sup>1</sup> Field Investigator(s): Kathurne Rundiauli, Beth Hendridson Date: 0/11/45 Project/Site: Orcut Planmit Area Site 221 Draut cm State: County: Sauta Barcara Applicant/Owner: \_\_\_\_\_\_Gillia Barbara County\_ Plant Community #/Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Wet- Madow Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook. Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community? Yes <u>X</u> No (If no, explain on back) Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ (If yes, explain on back) \_\_\_\_\_ VEGETATION Indicator Indicator Dominant Plant Species Status Stratum Dominant Plant Species Status Stratum FAC 1. Hordeum marinum Herb 11. -----FHC 2: Lolium 3P \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_12. \_\_\_ 3. Trifolium Nerius FACUL \_\_\_\_ 13. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Lohus corniculatus FACE \_\_\_\_ 14. \_\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Cotula coro nopitolia FACIN \_\_\_\_\_ 15. \_\_\_\_\_ 6. \_ \_\_\_\_ 16. \_\_\_\_\_ 7. -\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ 17. \_\_\_\_\_ 8 \_\_\_\_\_ 18. \_\_\_\_\_ 9. . \_\_\_\_\_ 19. \_\_\_\_\_\_ 10 \_ 20. \_\_\_\_\_ Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC $St^{n}$ Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes & No Rationale: MOOF SPP are FAC. FACU is balanced by FACU. SOILS Series/phase: \_\_\_\_\_Sandy loam \_\_\_\_\_Subgroup:<sup>2</sup> \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_<sup>xa</sup> Undetermined \_\_\_\_\_ Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Histic epipedon present? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Is the soil: Mottled? Yes No Gleyed? Yes ½ No Matrix Color: 2.5 y 3// Mottle Colors: Other hydric soil indicators: Oxidized whizespicers Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes X No Rationale: <u>glying, 1640 chroma, oxidized thizospheres</u> HYDROLOGY Is the ground surface inundated? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No $\underline{\times}$ Surface water depth: \_\_\_\_\_ Is the soil saturated? Yes $\underline{\times}$ No \_\_\_\_\_ Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes X No \_\_\_\_ Rationale: \_\_\_\_ Boil is wet, downsman of freshwater massle tubutary with sunface water. Margly (Eleocharis) Veg. has dropped out, but subsunface water flow continues, just new spread out. JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE Is the plant community a wetland? Yes Is the plant community a wetland? Yes <u>P</u>No\_\_\_\_\_ Rationale for jurisdictional decision: <u>Noge to box is inconclusive, but soils thydrology</u> are positivz <sup>1</sup> This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure. <sup>2</sup> Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

rissing.

### DATA FORM ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD<sup>1</sup>

Field Investigator(s): <u>Kathannin</u> Project/Site: <u>Orcult Plannin</u> Applicant/Owner: <u>Bauth Bau Note:</u> If a more detailed site desc	Cindual, Beth H ma, <u>Site 22: Orath Cu</u> Dara Counting Plar ription is necessary, us	State: <u>CA</u> State: <u>CA</u> the Community #/Nation the back of data	Date: - County: me: _ <u>Arup</u> form or a fi	6/11/95 Sauta Basico 11146 Orcostano eld notebook.	ب ۲ <u>۰</u>
Do normal environmental conditio Yes <u>//</u> No(If no, expla Has the vegetation, soils, and/or h YesNo <u>//</u> (If yes, expl	ns exist at the plant co ain on back) hydrology been significa ain on back)	mmunity? antly disturbed?			
	VEGE				• ••• ••
Dominant Plant Species 1. Hordeum marinum 2. Letwom sp	<u>Status</u> <u>Stratum</u> <u>FAC</u> <u>Herl</u> , <u>FAC</u>	Dominant Plant S 11 12	pecies	Status	Stratum
3.     Infpluem repens       4.	FACh V	13 14 15			
7 8 9		18 18 19			
Sercent of dominant species that s the hydrophytic vegetation crite Rationale:	are OBL, FACW, and/ prion met? Yes $\checkmark$	or FAC	° /2		
ieries/phase:	Yes No No Histic epin No Y Gleyed? Mottle No xo x1 d 12 d r/11 z Yes No X	Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermine pedon present? Ye Yes No Colors: cop <i>iceney</i>	d N > N 	ło	
the ground surface inundated? the soil saturated? Yes epth to free-standing water in pit st other field evidence of surface	HYDR Yes No Yos	DLOGY Surface water c	depth:		
the wetland hydrology criterion r ationale:	. 501 15 arg net? Yes No	<u>X</u>			
JURI	SDICTIONAL DETERM	MINATION AND R	ATIONALE		~
the plant community a wetland? ationale for jurisdictional decision	Yes No X : <u>Ulietation i</u> do list Michael	1 	uitahn Hand	Zybrut Hice	
This data form can be used for th Assessment Procedure. Classification according to "Soil T	e Hydric Soil Assessm axonomy."	ent Procedure and	the Plant (	Community	

8.3

		DATA	FORM		
RC	PUTINE ONS	511E DET (ຊຸ/	ERMINATION METHOD <sup>1</sup>		
Project/Site: Over the Planning An	<u>n manani b</u> 1911 Sili 22	: Chel	States (4 Date:	11/95	
Applicant/Owner: _ Sauta Bar	OGNA CEUD		t Community #/Name: 57064	<u>a Fa Darbure</u> a kas klaist	
Note: If a more detailed site descrip	ption is nece	ossary, us	e the back of data form or a field r	notebook. (Impor	mal
Do normal environmental condition	s exist at the				
YesNo (If no, explain	n on back)	plant col	intently i		
Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hy	drology bee	n significa	antly disturbed?		
	in on back)		х.		
		VEGE			
	Indicator	VLGL		Indicator	
Dominant Plant Species	Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Status Stratu	m
1LINDUS LEILITTALLUS	U15L	Hurt	11		
2			12		
4	·		14		
5			15		 
6 7	• <u> </u>		16		<u>-</u>
8			17		
9	·		19		
9			19 20		
9 10 Percent of dominant species that a ls the hydrophytic vegetation criter	are OBL, FA	CW, and/	19 20 or FAC	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
9 10 Percent of dominant species that a ls the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale:/ <i>vo</i> ?p	are OBL, FA ion met? Y OBL Speci	CW, and/	19 20 or FAC <i>100 07</i> 		
9. 10. Percent of dominant species that a Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale:/ <i>DD_C</i>	are OBL, FA	CW, and/ /es	19 20 or FAC <i>100 07.</i> _No		
9 10 Percent of dominant species that a ls the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale:/00 70 0	are OBL, FA	CW, and/ (es 2.5 SC	19 20 or FAC/ <i>00 0</i> ? _No		
9 10 Percent of dominant species that a Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale:/ <i>DD C</i> / <i>D C</i> / <i>D</i> Series/phase: Is the soil on the hydrin agin list?	are OBL, FA	CW, and/ (es y 23 SC	19 20 or FAC No MLS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup>		
9 10 Percent of dominant species that a Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale:/00 ?70 u Series/phase: Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes	Are OBL, FA	CW, and/ (es 23 SC No	19 20 or FAC No No NuLS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined Dedon present <sup>2</sup> . Yes		
9	Are OBL, FA ion met? \ (2)32 spec.( Yes No	CW, and/ (es 23 SC No Histic epip Gleyed?	19.         20.         20.         or FAC         /00 0%         No         No         VILS		
9 10 Percent of dominant species that a Is the hydrophytic vegetation criter Rationale:/DD_?? Series/phase: Series/phase: Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Is the soil a Histosol? Yes Is the soil: Mottled? Yes Matrix Color: Other hydric soil indicates	Are OBL, FA ion met? \ 013 L Speed Yes No I No I	CW, and/ (es // 2.3 SC No Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle	19 20 or FAC No No Nulls Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined Dedon present? Yes No Yes No Colors:		
9	Yes	CW, and/ (es // 2) SC No Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle	19 20 or FAC No MLS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined Dedon present? YesNo YesNo Colors:		
9	Are OBL, FAi         ion met?         (213 L Spear         Yes         No         No         No         No         es       1         H 100 Gp in	CW, and/ (es 23 SC No Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle No ØBL_UZZ	19 20 or FAC No MLS Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined vedon present? Yes No Yes No Colors:	Hooded So d.	
9	Are OBL, FA ion met? \ 013 L Specu Yes No No es I L 100 €₀ ii	CW, and/ (es // / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /	19.         20.         20.         20.         or FAC       100 %         No	Horacle d 50 cl.	
9	Are OBL, FA ion met? ↑ OBL Spect Yes Yes No No No es + 100 €o i	CW, and/ (es CW, and/ (es SC SC No Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle No OBL UT HYDR	19 20 or FAC No No No No No ViLS  Undetermined yes No Colors: <i>c.tahoric and paturatal/</i> DLOGY	Hoozied 50 el:	
9	Are OBL, FAi         ion met?         \(\mathcal{P}\) is \(\sigma\) is \(	CW, and/ (es	19 20 or FAC No No No No No No Ves No Colors: <i>c.ia.hor. and salmatal/;</i> DLOGY Surface water depth:	Hooded 50 di	
9	are OBL, FAt         ion met?         \(\Delta\) is preces         Yes         No         H         100         \$\mathcal{F}\$         Yes         No         Yes         Yes         No         Yes	CW, and/ (es // // (es // // SC SC No Histic epip Gleyed? Mottle No HYDR( No No	19 20 or FAC No No No VILS  Undetermined pedon present? Yes No Yes No Colors: <i>iteration and saturatul/j</i> DLOGY Surface water depth:	flooded 50 li	
9	are OBL, FAi         ion met?         \(\scale{132}\) Spect         \(\scale{132}\) Spect         Yes         No         Bes         H         100         Yes         Yes         No         Soil probe hc         inundation o	CW, and/ (es	19 20 20 20 20 20 20 No PlLS  	Hovelad So l.	
9	are OBL, FAt         ion met?         \(\screwtartartartartartartartartartartartartart	CW, and/ (es	19 20 20 20 20 20 20 No No No Yes No Colors: <u>ctation and saturatal</u> / <u>builded</u>	floorled 50 cl:	
9	are OBL, FAi         ion met?         j013 L Specution         Yes         No         No         es         F 100 Go in         soil probe ho         inundation o	CW, and/ (res	19 20 20 20 20 20 20 Include and a solver and a solver a sol	Horied Soll	
9	Are OBL, FAi         ion met?         \(\scale{132}\) Specie         Yes         No         No         es         I         Yes         No         es         I         Yes         No         es         No         soil probe ho         inundation o         net?         Yes	CW, and/ (es	19 20 20 20 20 20 20 Frestring Subgroup: <sup>2</sup> Undetermined yes No Yes No Colors: <i>itahiric and pahinatal/j</i> DLOGY Surface water depth: pration.	Hooded Sole	
9	are OBL, FAt         ion met?         \OBL Speak         Yes         No         No         es         100 €0         soil probe ho         inundation o         net?         Yes         No         ES         100 €0         inundation o         inet?         Yes         Intra and	CW, and/ (es	19 20 20 20 20 20 20 Pres YesNo YesNo Colors: <i>ictation and patronatel/j</i> DLOGY  Surface water depth: pration MINATION AND RATIONALE	floorteel 50 el:	
9	Are OBL, FA ion met? Y OBL Spear Yes No No Pes Yes No Soil probe ho inundation o net? Yes Conce Dictional	CW, and/ (res	19.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         20.         No         21.00 ??	Horacie diso di	