MARYLAND WETLAND ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT: Coastal Plain Region

Project/Site Name:	1 A A \.		City/County:			Sampling Date	:	
Assessment Area Name (if >1 AA): Delineation performed: previously concurrently Lat/I			Observer(s):			AA size: units		
Delineation performed: prev <u>Site Description</u> : (general land habitat richness; human and n	iously	Lat/Long: friparian corr ted by spoil p Iterations suc	ridor, presence o piles, beaver acti ch as culverts, ro	of braided/mul	g, vegetatic	stem, topography, veg on removal, pest impac	units getation patterns, complexity and ots, excessive flow; description of tographs of soil, nearest stream	
LANDSCAPE ASSESSIN Field observations to assis					sessment)		ion 3 tables to assign spaces)	
METRIC	J. 050/ J. 05 050/ J. = =	5 0 40′ T	750/			SCORE (use Sect	ion 3 tables to assign scores)	
Buffer Perimeter: %Natural:								
Buffer Condition: %Natural:								
Aquatic Context: 4 or mo	re aquatic resources 3	□ 2 □ 0-1	<u> </u>					
Comparative Size: ☐ Very la	ırge 🗆 Large 🗀 Medium	to small \square	Small to very sn	nall				
Source(s) of size reduction, i constructed drainage (into or	•	•			•	•	•	
From StreamStats: Impervious Additional channels in project				n project area	basin:			
WETLAND ASSESSME ENVIRONMENTAL INFO Landscape Position: Indicate a	PRMATION (Section 4.2) Il features present	,	Slope (de	eg/%):	Aspe	ct (if applicable):		
☐ Active floodplain ☐ Beaver pond/Natur		latural				Riparian terrace (outside seasonal flooding; historic		
(depression or terrace) Headwater stream/sprii				floodplain or current terrace) Isolated Depression				
□ Oxbow	☐ Wetland charg groundwater s slope)	ed by eeps (hill	☐ Streaml		☐ Point bar			
□ Flats								
Water Source: If more than on	a cource is present label a	e D (primary)	S (Secondary)	T (tertion/)				
	☐ Groundwater discharge		al surface		run-off/cul	verts		
☐ Overbank flooding	☐ High groundwater	□ Irrigati	ion	□ Pipes/	outfall (dire	ectly feeding wetland)		
Hydrological Regime: Circle th	e regime that best matches	the condition	ns in the AA					
H Permanently Flooded	G Intermittently Expose	ed FS	Semipermanently			nally Flooded	E Seasonally Flooded- Saturated	
B Seasonally Saturated	D Continuously Satura	ted A	Temporarily Floo	oded	I Intermit	ently Flooded	K Artificially Flooded	

Observations/Comments:
CLASSIFICATION OF AA TO KEY WILDLIFE HABITAT AND HGM CLASS (Section 4.3)
Key Wildlife Habitat: HGM Class: Optional: NVC Community Type/Plant Association:
Stream Key Wildlife Habitat Type: □Coastal Plain Stream □ Blackwater Stream □ Coastal Plain River
SOIL/SUBSTRATE (Section 4.4)
Note: if the floodplain does not naturally have hydric soils, and still does not have hydric soils under current conditions, only score Microtopography,
Organic Matter Accumulation, and Soil Disturbance.
Mapped Soil Type: Depth to water table Hydric soil? Hydric Soil Indicators: Depth of O horizon Depth of A horizon Extensive roots in soil? Soil Matrix Hue Value/Chroma
Note any deviations from the characteristics described for the mapped soil type for this AA and potential causes. Describe any impacts to the soil surface such as
trampling/compaction from animals or machinery, ruts or other disturbances from ATV or other vehicular activity, or sedimentation.
Observations/Comments (including for metrics below):
Soil Biogeochemical Processing:
Soil Redox concentrations: >10% surface area and □ start 0-6" from soil surface □ start >6-12" □ start >12-18"
<10% surface area and □ start 0-6" from soil surface □ start >6-12" □ None within 18" Score:
Soil Organic Matter: \square Horizon present (any thickness) \square Mineral surface layer(s) ≥ 4 " thick with matrix value ≤ 3 and chroma ≤ 2
☐ Mineral surface layer <4" thick and ☐ Matrix value ≤3 and chroma ≤2 ☐ Matrix value >3 and ≤4 or chroma >2 and ≤3 Score:
Microtopography: $□ \ge 50\%$ of Assessment Area $□ 30-49\%$ of AA $□ 10-29\%$ of AA $□ < 10\%$ of AA $□ < 10\%$ of AA Score:
Organic Matter Accumulation: Estimated ground cover of herbaceous/woody plants (living and dead residue):%
Estimated cover of leaf litter (loose leaves must be at least 1" thick or decaying leaves must have at least 5 stacked layers):%
% herbaceous/woody + % leaf litter: □ >75% □ >50-74% □>25-50% □ <25% Score:
Soil Disturbance: Presence of bare soil due to human activities: ☐ None/minimal ☐ Minor/small patches ☐ Moderate ☐ Substantial
Extent of impact of disturbance: □None □ Minimal □ Moderate □ Extensive
Depth of disturbance and ponding/channeling: ☐ None ☐ <2" ☐ 2-4", some ponding/channeling ☐ >4",ponding/channeling
Score:
HYDROLOGY (Section 4.5)
Water Source—Identify dominant water source and natural/unnatural influence for the AA by KWH type.
□ Natural: □ Sheet flow present □ Natural narrow channel present □ Mimics natural hydrology □ Groundwater input □ Expected overbank flooding
☐ Expected plant community ☐ Other
□ Unnatural/Manipulated: □ Impoundment □ Inflow from anthropogenic sources □ Fill □ Ditching □ Channelization □ Confined to small outlet □ Lost water
sources due to alterations ☐ Multiple sources and some degraded ☐ Incised and no longer floods ☐Other
Point Source Discharge (into or adjacent to site): □ Lacking □ Minor □ Moderate □ Major
Unnatural Obstructions (to ground or surface water): ☐ None ☐ Minor (<25%) ☐ Moderate (25-75%) ☐ Major (>75%)
Alteration to: ☐ Overland Flow ☐ Groundwater ☐ Overbank Flooding ☐ Plant Community ☐ Wetland Extent input
Timing: ☐ Recent (within 5 years) ☐ Historic ☐ Permanent hydrologic change
Negative effect: ☐ AA Flow and circulation ☐ Redirects or confines flows into/through AA ☐ Reduced water table ☐ Reduced inundation ☐ None
Score:
Observations/Comments:
Stream Bank and Channel – Describe the stream channel in the project area, including evidence of alteration and signs of recovery/stablization.
Evidence of bank/channel equilibrium: Recovering to meander Low energy stream with bare banks Variety of pool depths Variety of stream
velocities □ Visual flow of water from channel banks or wetlands (groundwater flow) □ Still pools with some flow and floodplain connection □ Embedded woody
debris of size and amount consistent with what is available in riparian area Well-defined usual high water line with obvious floodplain Little or no active
undercutting or burial of riparian vegetation Braided channels Other
Evidence of channel instability/migration: ☐ Riparian vegetation buried ☐ Recent sediment or gravel deposited ☐ Active incision/downcutting ☐ Braided
channels have coalesced Buried hydric soil and/or gravel layer and depth Other
Overall channel instability: □None/minimal □ Minor □ Moderate □ Substantial
Sources of channel instability/migration: Lacks vertical controls (vegetation, wood, rock, etc.) Excessive channel deposition/bar development Historic
channel alteration □ Proximity and landscape position presents potential impact to AA hydrology □ Other
Evidence of bank instability: Banks undercut, slides, and/or slumps Riparian vegetation declining Shrub/trees falling into channel Bank uniformly
scoured and unvegetated \(\propto \text{Other} \)

Overall bank instability: None/minimal Minor Substantial	
Sources of bank instability: ☐ Vertical banks ☐ Highly erodible materials ☐ Raw unvegetated banks ☐ Excessive bedload ☐ Other	
If available: Bank Erosion Hazard Index Near Bank Stress	Score:
Aquatic Life: (if available for site or use nearest, most recent Biological Stream Survey point in stream): Benthic IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <3 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Good (≥ 4) □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IBI- Value Rating: □ Fair (3-3.99) □ Poor <4 Fish IB	99) □ Poor <3
Observations/Comments:	
Hydroperiod and Hydrologic Connectivity – Determine the natural variability and/or recent alteration of the duration, frequency, and magnitud inundation/saturation in the AA by KWH type.	e of
Natural variation of hydroperiod: □ Low □ High Information Sources: □Visual indicators □ Monitoring Wells □ Hydrology/Hydraulic analysis □ Bank Height Ratio Entrenchment Ra	tio
Overbank flooding (if available): ☐ 2-year storm ☐ 10-year ☐ 100-year	
Degree of connection to floodplain: ☐ Complete Disconnection/entrenchment: ☐ Minimal ☐ Moderate ☐ Disconnected and/or severe Evidence of overbank flooding: ☐ Recent ☐ Evidence of overbank flooding ☐ Some evidence, likely during large storm events ☐ Genera	•
Change/Alteration of hydroperiod: ☐None ☐ Due to natural events ☐ Due to human influences: ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Substant	
☐ Backwater flooding or lateral movement affected by restrictions: List restrictions:	Score:
Observations/Comments:	
KEY WILDLIFE HABITAT (Section 4.6) Interspersion/Patch Richness –interspersion of vegetation patches and number of different obvious types of physical surfaces or features that habitat for aquatic, wetland, or riparian animal species.	may provide
Interspersion of habitats/physical features (see examples): ☐ High ☐ Moderate ☐ Low or Minimal ☐ None or Few	
Features present: ☐ Spring or upwelling groundwater ☐ Depression ☐ Vegetated pool ☐ Unvegetated pool ☐ Unvegetated flat ☐ Island ☐ burrow ☐ Beaver dam or lodge ☐ Beaver-chewed vegetation ☐ Oxbow, swale, secondary channel ☐ Wind-thrown tree hole ☐ Mound ☐ Banl	
tree roots 🗆 Tip-up tree root mound 🗅 Brush piles 🗀 Abundant deciduous leaf litter 🗆 Partially buried natural debris 🗅 Debris jam 🗅 Plant hum	nmock/tussocks
□Other wildlife habitat Wildlife species observed: Observations/Comments:	Score:
Vertical Structure – Refer to metrics for selected Key Wildlife Habitat Type for scoring.	
$\underline{\textbf{Forested systems:}} \ \textbf{Canopy:} \ \textbf{Heterogeneous patches of different ages or sizes:} \ \square \ \textbf{Yes} \ \square \ \textbf{Mostly} \ \square \ \textbf{Somewhat} \ \square \ \textbf{No}$	
☐ Gaps of varying sizes ☐ Impacted by beaver activity ☐ Impacted by forest pests/pathogens Woody vertical layers: ☐ Multiple layers present ☐ One layer missing or homogeneous ☐ >1 layer missing, little variation ☐ Only 1-2 layer	ers present
Large trees (DBH > 60 cm or 24") present: $\square \ge 10\%$ \square <10%	•
Trees present with DBH > 30 cm or 12": $\square \ge 20\%$ $\square < 20\%$ Degradation due to cutting, browsing, pests/pathogens: \square Minimal \square Moderate \square Extensive Source(s) of degradation:	
Bog and Fen systems: Woody layer mortality (if layer present): \Box Due to natural factors \Box Minor human-caused \Box Moderate human-caused	sed
 □ Extensive human- caused □ Impacted by forest pests/pathogens □ Impacted by browsing/grazing Expected structure: □ Present □ Minor alteration □ Moderate Alteration □ Extensive Alteration 	Score :
Observations/Comments:	
Standing and Downed Coarse Woody Debris – Refer to metrics for selected Key Wildlife Habitat type for scoring.	
Forested systems: Standing snags and downed logs: Size diversity: High Moderate Moderate-low Low	ariahilih.
Stage of downed log decay: ☐ Variable including advanced stage ☐ Variable with few advanced ☐ Variable with no advanced ☐ Low variable with not natural (cutting, pest/pathogens, etc.):	•
Bog and Fen systems: Woody and/or litter: ☐ Typical peat accumulation ☐ Human-caused alteration Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Substantial ☐ forest pests/pathogens	Impacted by
Ground cover alterations: ☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Substantial	Score:
Observations/Comments:	

VEGETATION (Section 4.6) Additional species may be listed on a separate sheet. See Scoring Sheet for %cover examples.

NOTE: Include native diagnostic, disturbance indicator, and state rare, threatened, and endangered species regardless of %co
--

Species:	Absolute %	Species:	Absolute %				
	Cover		Cover				
Tree Stratum: woody plants, excluding woody vines, approximately 20 ft (6 m) or more in height and 3 in. (7.6 cm) or larger DBH							
1.		5.					
2.		6.					
3.		7.					
4.		8.					
Sapling Stratum: woody plants, excluding woody vines, approximately 20 ft (6 m) or more in height and less than 3 in. (7.6 cm) DBH							
1.		4.					
2.		5.					
3.		6.					
Shrub Stratum: woody plants, excluding woody vines, approxi	mately 3 to 20	ft (1 to 6 m) in height					
1.		6.					
2.		7.					
3.		8.					
4.		9.					
5.		10.					
Herb Stratum: all herbaceous (non-woody) plants, including herbaceous vines, regardless of size, and woody species, except woody vines, less than							
approximately 3 ft (1 m) in height	T	I -					
1.		7.					
2.		8.					
3.		9.					
4.		10					
5.		11.					
6.		12.					
Woody Vine Stratum: all woody vines, regardless of height							
1.		4.					
2.		5.					
3.		6.					

KWH VEGETATION COMPOSITION (Use tables in Section 4.6 to assign scores).

Invasive Species:	
Maximum invasive species cover in any one woody layer (if present): □ <1% □ 1- 5% □ >5-10% □ >10%	
Absolute cover of invasive/disturbance species in herbaceous layer: □ <1% □ 1-5% □ >5-30% □ >30%	Score:
Observations/Comments:	
Native Species: Refer to metrics for selected Key Wildlife Habitat Type for scoring.	
	Гоши
Woody layer (if present): ☐ Dominated by diagnostic native species ☐ Some diagnostic species absent/reduced ☐ Few diagnostic species	i □ Few/no
diagnostic species present	
Herbaceous layer: ☐ Dominated by diagnostic native species ☐ Some diagnostic species absent/reduced ☐ Few diagnostic species ☐ Fe	w/no diagnostic
	Willo diagnostic
species present	
Cover of native species indicative of disturbance: 0-1% 2-10% >10-30% >30%	
Bog and Fen/Springs: Sphagnum cover - □ Continuous/abundant □ Absent from small areas □ Reduced □ Very low	Score:
	3core
Observations/Comments:	
Alterations/Stressors: Indicate stressors and alterations affecting the observed vegetation composition of the AA.	
ů ů	
☐ Recent timber harvest (clearcut or selective cut) ☐ Tree plantation ☐ Mowing or shrub cutting ☐ Herbicide use ☐ Trampling/ORV ☐ Exce	essive animal
herbivory ☐ Pest damage ☐ Unnatural fire regime ☐ Trash/dumping	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
□ Other	
Suggestions for improving native species cover and natural vegetation composition	
Observations/Comments:	
Floristic Quality Assessment: (see Excel data sheet or manual for calculation):	
Native mean C-value : □>4 □ 3-4 □ <3-2 □ <2	
Adjusted FQI	
Adjusted I &I	0
	Score:

MARYLAND WETLAND ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT: Coastal Plain Region SCORING FORM

Project/Site Name:	City/County:	_ Sampling Date:
Assessment Area Name (if >1 AA):	Observer(s):	
Scoring Scale: 3.5- 4 = Excelle	nt 2.5-3.49 = Good 1.5-2.49 = F	air 1-1.49 = Poor

Core Factor	Metric	Metric Score	Mean Core Factor Score	Weighting Factor	Overall Core Factor Score (Mean Core Factor Score X Weighting Factor)	
Landscape	Buffer Perimeter		(Sum of metric			
(Assessment for	Buffer Condition		scores:) / 4	0.3		
project area)	Aquatic Context		=			
	Comparative Size					
Soil/Substrate*	Redox Concentrations		(Sum of metric			
* If only Microtopography,	Microtopography		scores:) / 5	0.1		
Organic Matter	Soil Organic Matter		or /3* =			
Accumulation, and Soil Disturbance were scored,	Organic Matter Accumulation					
divide by 3 rather than 5	Soil Disturbance					
Hydrology	Water source		(Sum of metric			
,	Channel		scores:) / 3	0.2		
	Hydroperiod and Hydrologic		T =			
	Connectivity					
Key Wildlife Habitat	Interspersion/Patch Richness		(Sum of metric			
and Vegetation	Vertical Structure		scores:) / 6	0.4		
Composition	Coarse Woody Debris		=			
	Invasive Species					
	Native Species Composition					
	Floristic Quality Assessment					
	actor Scores = Overall KWH Ed					
maximum of +0.2 for WRR la	al Section 3.5): Mark all categories preservers:	nt in wkk layer	s. Assign the single nignest	score for a		
☐ Nontidal Wetlands of Spe						
☐ Biodiversity Conservation						
☐ Forest Interior Dwelling Sp						
☐ Targeted Ecological Area	, ,					
☐ Sensitive Species Project						
	From MDE Tier II High Quality Waters (Section 3.5):					
Upstream of, within, or adjacent to Tier II High Quality stream segment (+ 0.2)						
From StreamStats (see Manual Section 3.5): ☐ Impervious surface area for project area basin is low (< 5%) (+ 0.2)						
☐ Forest cover in project area basin is >90% (+ 0.2)						
From field observations (see Manual Section 5.1):						
☐ Maryland nontidal wetland(s) with significant plant or wildlife value (as defined by COMAR 26.23.01.01B80) but not						
designated as a Nontidal Wetland of Special State Concern (add + 0.2 for each wetland to the Overall EIA score)						
☐ State rare, threatened, or endangered plants or state rare natural community noted during field data collection but not mapped in Biodiversity Conservation Network Tier 1, 2, or 3 (+ 0.2)						
□ Sensitive species (colonial waterbird nesting colony, native mussel bed, anadromous fish) (+ 0.1)						
☐ Dominated by native trees						
-	i.e., acorns and nuts) producing native spe		•			
.,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					

FINAL Key Wildlife Habitat Ecological Integrity Assessment SCORE and RATING: _

Comments: