APPENDIX H – INTERCONNECTION AREA SITING STUDY (PUBLIC)



November 29, 2018

Michael Svedeman Manager, Project Development Invenergy LLC 1401 17th Street, Suite 1100 Denver, CO 80202

Re: Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm Interconnection Area Siting Study, For Public Disclosure

Dear Mr. Svedeman:

INTRODUCTION

Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC (Deuel Harvest) plans to construct the Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm (Project), an up to 310.1-megawatt (MW) wind farm in Deuel County, South Dakota. Burns & McDonnell Engineering, Inc. (Burns & McDonnell) conducted a wetland delineation, threatened and endangered species habitat survey, Level III intensive cultural resources investigation, reconnaissance-level survey for historic-age non-archeological resources, and a prime farmland impact analysis for the Project.

Design changes resulted in the relocation of the proposed interconnection substation, a portion of the transmission line corridor, Project substation, temporary laydown yard, and Operations and Maintenance building (Interconnection Area). The Interconnection Area totaled approximately 30.2 acres. Burns & McDonnell conducted an analysis to evaluate for the presence of wetlands and other waterbodies, threatened and endangered species, cultural resources, historic-age non-archeological resources, and prime farmland within the Interconnection Area. The following summarizes the results of this analysis.

METHODS Cultural Resources [Text Redacted]

Historic Resources Existing Data Review [Text Redacted]

Historic-Age Non-Archaeological Resource Survey [Text Redacted]

Waters of the U.S. *Existing Data Review*

Burns & McDonnell reviewed available background information for the Interconnection Area prior to conducting a site visit. This available background information included a USGS 7.5-minute topographic map (Clear Lake Northeast quadrangle; USGS, 2015), U.S. Fish & Wildlife



Service (USFWS) National Wetland Inventory (NWI) data (USFWS, 1981), the USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD; USGS, 2004), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) aerial photography (USDA, 2015a), and USDA NRCS 2015 SSURGO digital data for Deuel County, SD (USDA, 2015b). Maps generated from this available data are included as Figures A-4 and A-5 in Appendix A.

Wetland Delineation

A wetland delineation was completed on November 14, 2018, in accordance with the 1987 *Corps* of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (1987 Manual; USACE, 1987) and the 2010 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region – Version 2.0 (Regional Supplement; USACE, 2010). Locations of identified features were surveyed using a sub-meter accurate global positioning system (GPS) unit (Figure A-6, Appendix A). Natural color photographs were taken onsite and are included in Appendix E (Photographs E-1 to E-5).

Threatened and Endangered Species

A review of the Interconnection Area was completed to evaluate habitat potentially capable of supporting the Dakota skipper (*Hesperia dacotae*), federally listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544, 87 Stat. 884), as amended, and the Poweshiek skipperling (*Oarisma poweshiek*), federally listed as an endangered species. Coordination with the USFWS occurred prior to the start of the assessment (Burns & McDonnell, 2018). USFWS guideline used in this evaluation followed those detailed in Burns & McDonnell (2018) for the Project.

Desktop review of the digital information was completed to identify areas of native tallgrass prairie within the Interconnection Area that have the potential of containing suitable protected butterfly species habitat. Digital information included locations of potentially undisturbed native grasslands obtained from South Dakota State University (South Dakota State University, 2016), National Land Cover Data (NLCD; USDA, 2018), NAIP aerial photography (USDA, 2015a), USFWS NWI maps (USFWS, 1981), multiple years of Google Earth imagery (Google Earth, 2018), and USFWS conservation, grassland, and wetland easement locations obtained from Deuel Harvest.

A field assessment for potential suitable habitat for the Dakota skipper and Poweshiek skipperling was completed on November 14, 2018 during the same mobilization effort as the wetland delineation. A habitat evaluation flowchart that was developed by Dennis Skadsen, a USFWS-permitted surveyor for Dakota skippers and Poweshiek skipperlings (USFWS Permit TE65611B-0; Skadsen, 2017), was used in the field for identifying potential habitat suitable for supporting Dakota skippers and Poweshiek skipperlings, as discussed with the USFWS (Burns & McDonnell, 2018).



Prime Farmland

A desktop study was conducted to evaluate for the presence or absence of prime farmland within the Interconnection Area. This available data was collected from the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 2015 SSURGO digital data for Deuel County, South Dakota (USDA, 2015b).

RESULTS Cultural Resources [Text Redacted]

Historic Resources [Text Redacted]

Waters of the U.S.

Existing Data Review

The existing USGS topographic map was reviewed to familiarize Burns & McDonnell wetland personnel with the topography and potential locations of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. (Figure A-4). The USGS topographic map indicates the Interconnection Area crosses a relatively flat area.

The NWI data indicates that three palustrine emergent (PEM) wetlands are located within the Interconnection Area. The 2015 aerial photograph indicates that the Interconnection Area consists of crop land (Figures A-5 and A-6). There are no NHD-indicated streams crossing the Interconnection Area.

The NRCS SSURGO digital data indicates that portions of four soil map units are located in the Interconnection Area (Figure A-5). All of the soil map units are included on local and national hydric soil lists:

- FmB Forman-Aastad loams, 1 to 6 percent slopes
- Pc Parnell-Vallers complex
- FtC Forman-Buse-Aastad loams, 2 to 9 percent slopes
- FtD Forman-Buse-Aastad loams, 2 to 15 percent slopes

Wetland Delineation

Two wetlands and no streams were identified during the wetland delineation efforts.

Wetland 1 (W-1). W-1 is a 0.40-acre PEM wetland (Figure A-6). Vegetation in W-1 was dominated by barnyard grass (*Echinochloa crus-galli*) and reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*). Wetland hydrology was indicated by a positive FAC neutral test, drainage



patterns, and a concave geomorphic position. The soil was highly disturbed due to agricultural practices, and hydric soil indicators were not observed. Per guidance of the Regional Supplement, hydric soil was assumed due to the presence of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology.

Wetland 2 (W-2). W-2 is a 0.31-acre PEM wetland (Figure A-6). Vegetation in W-2 was dominated by barnyard grass. Wetland hydrology was indicated by a positive FAC neutral test, drainage patterns, a concave geomorphic position, and the presence of standing water. A soil sample was not taken due to the presence of a restrictive layer (ice). Hydric soil is assumed due to the presence hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology.

Threatened and Endangered Species

No potential suitable habitat for the Dakota skipper or Poweshiek skipperling was identified within the Interconnection Area. The Interconnection Area is located in actively farmed rowcrop agriculture fields, is highly disturbed, and contains no native grassland within the Interconnection Area.

Prime Farmland

The Interconnection Area is located primarily in agriculture land. Of the 30.2 acres within the Interconnection Area, 16.5 acres are classified as prime farmland, 6.1 acres are classified as farmland of statewide importance, and, and 7.6 acres are classified as non-prime farmland (Figure A-7).



REFERENCES CITED

- Burns & McDonnell. (2018). 2018 Protected Butterfly Species Report for the Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm. Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC.
- Google Earth 6.2. (2018). Historical imagery data layer for Deuel County, South Dakota. Available online at: http://www.google.com/earth/index.html.
- Skadsen, D. (2017). Flow Chart for Habitat Evaluation of Federally Protected Butterfly Habitat in Northeast South Dakota. Unpublished data.
- South Dakota State University. (2016). Quantifying Undisturbed (Native) Lands in Eastern South Dakota: 2013. Available online at: https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/data_land-easternSD/1/.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (1987). Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2010). Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest (Version 2.0). Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2015a). NAIP 2015: Orthoimagery. Retrieved August 2018 from https://gdg.sc.egov.usda.gov/.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. (2015b). Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Deuel County, South Dakota. Retrieved August 2018 from http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service. (2018). GeoSpatial Data Gateway, National Land Cover Data. Available online at: https://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/GDGOrder Contact.aspx.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1981). *National Wetlands Inventory*. Retrieved August 2018 from http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/.
- U.S. Geological Survey (2004). National Hydrography Dataset. Reston, VA.: U.S. Geological Survey
- U.S. Geological Survey. (2015). Clear Lake Northeast quadrangle, South Dakota (1:24,000. 7.5 Minute Series). Washington D.C.: U.S. Geological Survey.



If you have any questions or require additional information, feel free to contact me by telephone at (816) 349-6770 or by e-mail at bgasper@burnsmcd.com.

Sincerely,

Bayon R. Conspe-

Bryan Gasper Senior Environmental Scientist

cc: Jack Middleton, Burns & McDonnell

APPENDIX A - FIGURES

[Figures A-1 through A-2 Redacted]



	174th S1	174th St	174th St	174th St	174th St 174th St
1125 1	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A		A AN	CON CIENC	ASTI. Ave
	175th-St	175th St		175th St	175th-St 175th St
	2nd Ave			68 ¢th Ave	
	176th St	176th S1	176th St	176th St	
MT	ND SD SD	IN Interconnection Area	2,000 1,000 0	2,000	Figure A-3 General Location Map Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm Interconnection Area Siting Study Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC Deuel County, SD

Source: Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc.

Path: Z:\Clients\ENS\Invenergy\103753_DeuelPUC\Studies\Geospatial\DataFiles\ArcDocs\Wetlands\Interconnection Study\Invenergy_FigureA4_NWITopo.mxd jkensinger 11/20/2018 COPYRIGHT © 2018 BURNS & McDONNELL ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC. Service Layer Credits: Copyright:© 2013 National Geographic Society, i-cubed



Source: ESRI, USFWS NWI Wetlands, USGS NHD, Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc

Path: Z:\Clients\ENS\Invenergy\103753_DeuelPUC\Studies\Geospatial\DataFiles\ArcDocs\Wetlands\Interconnection Study\Invenergy_FigureA4_SSURGO.mxd jkensinger 11/20/2018 COPYRIGHT © 2018 BURNS & McDONNELL ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC. Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Path: Z:\Clients\ENS\Invenergy\103753_DeuelPUC\Studies\Geospatial\DataFiles\ArcDocs\Wetlands\Interconnection Study\Invenergy_FigureA6_WDR.mxd brichards 11/20/2018 COPYRIGHT © 2018 BURNS & McDONNELL ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC. Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Source: Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company Inc.

Path: Z:\Clients\ENS\Invenergy\103753_DeuelPUC\Studies\Geospatial\DataFiles\ArcDocs\Wetlands\Interconnection Study\Invenergy_FigureA7_Prime Farmland.mxd brichards 11/21/2018 COPYRIGHT © 2018 BURNS & McDONNELL ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC. Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

APPENDIX B - HISTORIC PHOTOSHEET

[Photosheet Redacted]

APPENDIX C - HISTORIC INVENTORY TABLE

[Table Redacted]

APPENDIX D - WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORMS, MIDWEST REGION

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Deuel Harv	vest North Interc	connectio	n Area Siting	g Study City/County: Deuel County Sampling Date: 11/14/2018
Applicant/Owner: Deue	I Harvest Wind I	Energy Ll	_C	State: <u>SD</u> Sampling Point: <u>SP-1</u>
Investigator(s): J. Kens	inger, B. Salupo)		Section, Township, Range: <u>S24, T116N, R48W</u>
Landform (hillslope, terrac	e, etc.) <u>Toes</u>	lope		Local relief (concave, convex, none): <u>Convex</u> Slope (%): <u>2 %</u>
Subregion (LRR): M				Lat: _44.848158 Long:96.539165 Datum: _NAD83
Soil Map Unit Name: Pa	arnell-Vallers co	mplex		NWI Classification: N/A
Are climate/hydrologic cor	nditions on the s	ite typica	l for this time	e of year? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No (If no, explain in Remarks)
	Vegetation	Soil	Hydrology	Are "Normal Circumstances" present? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Significantly Disturbed? Naturally Problematic?				(If needed, explain any answers in Remarks)
SUMMARY OF FINDIN	GS – Attach s	site map	showing	sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.
		Yes	No	Remarks: Upland confirmation sample plot. The Palmer Drought Severity Index
Hydrophytic Vegetation F	Present?		\boxtimes	indicates that the area is experiencing moderately moist climate/hydrologic
Hydric Soil Present?		\boxtimes		conditions.
Wetland Hydrology Prese	ent?		\boxtimes	
Is the Sampled Area wit	thin a Wetland	?	\boxtimes	
VEGETATION – Use se	cientific name	es of pla	ants	
			Abo	colute % Dominant Indicator Dominance Test Workshoot

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Cover	Species?	Status	Dominance Test worksheet:	
1	00vei %	Opecies:	Olalus	Number of Dominant Species	
2	%	·		that are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)	
3	<u>%</u>	·		Total Number of Dominant	
4	<u>%</u>			Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)	
5.	%				
	0 %	= Total Cover		Percent of Dominant Species	4)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')					''
1. <u> </u>	%			Prevalence Index Worksheet:	
2.	%			Total % Cover of: Multiply by:	
3	%			OBL species % x 1 = 0	
4	%			FACW species % x 2 = 0	
5	%			FAC species % x 3 = 0	
	0 %	= Total Cover		FACU species % x 4 = 0	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')				UPL species% x 5 =	
1. Bromus inermis	60 %	Y	FACU	Column Totals: <u>0</u> % (A) <u>0</u> (B)
2. Xanthium strumarium	10 %	N	FAC	Prevalence Index = B/A =	
3. Echinochloa crus-galli	10 %	N	FACW		
4	%			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
5	%				
6	%			Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
7	%			☐ Dominance Test is >50%	
8	%	·		☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹	
9	%	·			
	<u> 80 %</u>	= Total Cover		data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)	
$(\text{Plot size: } \frac{30}{30})$	0/			Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (explain)	
1	<u> </u>			1 Indicators of hydric soil and watland hydrology	
2		·		must be present, unless disturbed or problematic	;
·	0 %	= Total Cover		Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	5
Remarks (Include photo numbers here or on a separate she	eet): No tests passe	d. Photo E-1.			

SOIL

Profile Descr	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docu	ment the	indicator or	confirm the	absence of indicators.)	
Depth	Matrix		F	Redox Fea	itures			
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-3	10YR 2/1	100					Clay Loam	
3-12	10YR 2/1	85	7.5YR 3/4	15	С	Μ	Clay Loam	
12-24	10YR 2/1	85	7.5YR 3/3	10	C	M	Clay Loam	
			10YR 6/1	5	D	M		
		·						
¹ Type: C=Co	ncentration D=Dep	letion RM		 S=Covere	d or Coated	Sand Grains	² l ocation: PI =Pore Lini	ng M=Matrix
Undria Call I	adiaatawa							Undria Caila ³
Hydric Soll Ir	idicators:						Indicators for Problematic	Hydric Solis":
Histosol (A	(1)		Sandy Gl	eyed Matr	ix (S4)		🗌 Coast Prairie Redox (A16	5)
Histic Epip	edon (A2)		🗌 Sandy Re	dox (S5)		Dark Surface (S7)		
Black Histi	ic (A3)		Stripped I	Matrix (S6)	Iron-Manganese Masses	(F12)	
Hydrogen	Sulfide (A4)		🗌 Loamy Mi	ucky Mine	ral (F1)	Very Shallow Dark Surfac	e (TF 12)	
Stratified L	ayers (A5)		🗌 Loamy Gl	eyed Matr	ix (F2)	Other (Explain in Remarks)	. ,	
🗌 2 cm Muck	k (A10)		Depleted	Matrix (F3	5)	_ (; ,		
Depleted E	Below Dark Surface	(A11)	🛛 Redox Da	ark Surface	e (F6)			
Thick Dark	Surface (A12)		Depleted	Dark Surfa	ace (F7)	³ Indicators of hydrophytic ve	getation and	
Sandy Mu	cky Mineral (S1)		🗌 Redox De	pressions	(F8)	wetland hydrology must be	present, unless	
5 cm Muck	(S3) wy Peat or Peat						disturbed or problematic.	
Restrictive L	ayer (if present):						Hydric Soil Present?	
Туре:		_ [Depth (inches):				Yes 🗌 No	
Remarks: Hvo	dric soil indicator F6	is present						
		P 211						
l								

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	:				
Primary Indicators (minimum of o	one requ	ired; che	eck all that apply)		Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
☐ Surface Water (A1)			🗌 Water-Stair	ied Leaves (B9)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
☐ High Water Table (A2)			🗌 Aquatic Fau	ına (B13)	Drainage Patterns (B10)
Saturation (A3)			🗌 True Aquati	c Plants (B14)	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
🔲 Water Marks (B1)			🗌 Hydrogen S	sulfide Odor (C1)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)
Sediment Deposits (B2)			Oxidized R	nizospheres on Living Roots (C3)	Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Drift Deposits (B3)			Presence o	f Reduced Iron (C4)	Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)			Recent Iron	Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Geomorphic Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)			Thin Muck S	Surface (C7)	☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Ir	magery (B7)	☐ Gauge or W	/ell Data (D9)	
Sparsely Vegetated Concave	Surface	(B8)	Other (Expla	iin in Remarks)	
Field Observations:	Yes	No	Depth (inches)	Describe Recorded Data (stream g inspections, etc.), if available:	auge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous
Surface Water present?		\boxtimes			
Water Table present?		\boxtimes			
Saturation Present?		\boxtimes			
(includes capillary fringe)					
Wetland Hydrology Present?		\boxtimes			
Remarks: No indicators are pres	ent				

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Deuel Harvest North Interconnection A	rea Siting	g Study City/County: Deuel County Sampling Date: 11/14/2018
Applicant/Owner: Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC		State: SD Sampling Point: SP-2
Investigator(s): J. Kensinger, B. Salupo		Section, Township, Range: <u>S24, T116N, R48W</u>
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.) depression		Local relief (concave, convex, none): <u>concave</u> Slope (%): <u>2 %</u>
Subregion (LRR): M		Lat: _44.847439 Long:96.540802 Datum:NAD83
Soil Map Unit Name: Parnell-Vallers complex		NWI Classification: N/A
Are climate/hydrologic conditions on the site typical fo	r this time	e of year? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No (If no, explain in Remarks)
Vegetation Soil H	lydrology	Are "Normal Circumstances" present? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Significantly Disturbed?INaturally Problematic?I		(If needed, explain any answers in Remarks)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map s	howing	sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.
Yes	No	Remarks: PEM (W-1). The Palmer Drought Severity Index indicates that the area
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?		is experiencing moderately moist climate/hydrologic conditions.
Hydric Soil Present?		
Wetland Hydrology Present?		
Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? $igsqcelow$		
VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plant	S	
(Plot size: 20')	Abso	olute % Dominant Indicator Dominance Test Worksheet:
1		% Number of Dominant Species

(1. 101 01201 <u>00</u>)	eere epecieei etaaa	
1.	%	Number of Dominant Species
2.		that are OBL, FACW, or FAC:(A)
3.		Total Number of Dominant
4	<u> </u>	Species Across All Strata: (B)
5		
0		Percent of Dominant Species
O an line w/O handle O that there are (Distance of the Charles of		that are OBL, FACW, or FAC:(A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>15'</u>)	24	Prevalence Index Worksheet:
1	<u> </u>	
2	<u> </u>	Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
3	%	OBL species% x 1 =
4	<u>%</u>	FACW species% x 2 =
5	%	FAC species% x 3 =
	<u>0 %</u> = Total Cover	FACU species% x 4 =
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')		UPL species% x 5 =
1. Echinochloa crus-galli	60 % Y FACW	Column Totals: <u>0</u> % (A) <u>0</u> (B)
2. Phalaris arundinacea	30 % Y FACW	Prevalence Index = B/A =
3. Elvmus trachvcaulus	15 % N FACU	
4. Setaria pumila	10 % N FAC	Undrankutia Vagatatian Indiastara
5. Helianthus annuus	10 % N FACU	Hydrophylic vegetation indicators:
6	<u>%</u> <u> </u>	Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7	<u>%</u>	☐ Dominance Test is >50%
8	<u>%</u>	☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
9	<u> % </u>	
	<u>125 %</u> = Total Cover	Morphological Adaptations' (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30'</u>)		
1	%	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (explain)
2	%	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology
3	%	must be present, unless disturbed or problematic
	<u>0 %</u> = Total Cover	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? 🛛 Yes 🔲 No

SOIL

Depth	Matrix		F	Redox Fea	atures			
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-12	10YR 2/1	100					Silty Clay Loam	
12-24	10YR 2/1	95	10YR 3/3	5	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	
						·		
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Deplet	tion, RM	Reduced Matrix, C	S=Covere	d or Coated	Sand Grains	² Location: PL=Pore Lini	ng, M=Matrix
Hydric Soil I	ndicators:						Indicators for Problematic	Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol (A	A1)		🗌 Sandy Gle	eyed Matr	ix (S4)		Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
Histic Epi	pedon (A2)		🗌 Sandy Re	dox (S5)		☐ Dark Surface (S7)		
Black Hist	tic (A3)		Stripped N	/latrix (S6)	☐ Iron-Manganese Masses	(F12)	
Hydrogen	Sulfide (A4)		🗌 Loamy Mu	ucky Mine	ral (F1)	Very Shallow Dark Surfac	(TF 12)	
Stratified	Layers (A5)		🗌 Loamy Gl	eyed Mat	ix (F2)	\square Other (Explain in Remarks)		
2 cm Muc	k (A10)		Depleted	Matrix (F3	3)			
Depleted	Below Dark Surface (A	(11)	🗌 Redox Da	rk Surfac	e (F6)			
Thick Dar	k Surface (A12)	,	Depleted	Dark Surf	ace (F7)		³ Indicators of hydrophytic ve	getation and
Sandy Mu	icky Mineral (S1)		Redox De	pressions	(F8)	wetland hydrology must be present, unles	present, unless	
5 cm Muc	ky Peat or Peat (S3)				. ,		disturbed or problematic.	
Restrictive L	ayer (if present):						Hydric Soil Present?	
Туре:		0	Depth (inches):				🖾 Yes 🔲 No	
Romarke: Uu	dric coil is assumed du	le to the	presence of hydron	hytic year	tation and w	etland hydrol		
Remarks. Hy	und soil is assumed dt		presence of hydrop	nyuc vege	alion and w	elianu nyurolo	by mulcators.	

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	:				
Primary Indicators (minimum of o	one requ	ired; che	eck all that apply)		Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
Surface Water (A1)			🗌 Water-Stain	ied Leaves (B9)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
☐ High Water Table (A2)			🗌 Aquatic Fau	ına (B13)	🛛 Drainage Patterns (B10)
Saturation (A3)			🗌 True Aquati	c Plants (B14)	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
🗌 Water Marks (B1)			🗌 Hydrogen S	sulfide Odor (C1)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)
Sediment Deposits (B2)			Oxidized Rh	nizospheres on Living Roots (C3)	Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Drift Deposits (B3)			Presence of	f Reduced Iron (C4)	Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)			Recent Iron	Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Geomorphic Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)			Thin Muck S	Surface (C7)	⊠ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Ir	magery (B7)	🗌 Gauge or W	/ell Data (D9)	
Sparsely Vegetated Concave	Surface	e (B8)	🗌 Other (Expla	iin in Remarks)	
Field Observations:	Yes	No	Depth (inches)	Describe Recorded Data (stream g inspections, etc.), if available:	auge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous
Surface Water present?		\boxtimes			
Water Table present?		\boxtimes			
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)		\boxtimes			
Wetland Hydrology Present?	\boxtimes				
Remarks: Indicators B10, D2, an	id D5 are	e presen	t.		

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Deuel Harvest North Interconnection	n Area Siting	Study City/County: Deuel County Sampling Date: 11/14/2018
Applicant/Owner: Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LL	LC	State: <u>SD</u> Sampling Point: <u>SP-3</u>
Investigator(s): J. Kensinger, B. Salupo		Section, Township, Range: <u>S24, T116N, R48W</u>
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.) <u>Terrace</u>		_ Local relief (concave, convex, none): <u>Convex</u> Slope (%): <u>2 %</u>
Subregion (LRR): M		Lat: _44.847516 Long:96.540607 Datum:NAD83
Soil Map Unit Name:Forman-Aastad loams, 1 to	o 6 percent slo	opes NWI Classification: N/A
Are climate/hydrologic conditions on the site typica	I for this time	of year? 🛛 Yes 🔤 No (If no, explain in Remarks)
VegetationSoilSignificantly Disturbed?INaturally Problematic?I	Hydrology	Are "Normal Circumstances" present? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map	showing s	sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.
Yes Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present? Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Nº ⊠⊠⊠	Remarks: Upland plot adjacent to PEM (W-1). The Palmer Drought Severity Index indicates that the area is experiencing moderately moist climate/hydrologic conditions.
VEGETATION – Use scientific names of pla	ants	

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Absolute % Dominant Indicate	Dr Dominance Test Worksheet:
1.	%	, Number of Dominant Species
2.	<u> </u>	that are OBL, FACW, or FAC:(A)
3.	<u> </u>	Total Number of Dominant
4.	<u> </u>	Species Across All Strata: (B)
5.	<u> </u>	
	<u> 0 %</u> = Total Cover	that are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>15'</u>)		Prevalence Index Worksheet
1	<u> </u>	
2	%	Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
3	<u>%</u>	OBL species% x 1 =
4	<u>%</u>	FACW species% x 2 =0
5	<u>%</u>	FAC species% x 3 =
	<u>0 %</u> = Total Cover	FACU species% x 4 =0
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')		UPL species% x 5 =
1.	%	Column Totals: <u>0</u> % (A) <u>0</u> (B)
2.	%	Prevalence Index = B/A =
3	%	
4	%	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
5	<u>%</u>	
6	<u>%</u>	Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7	%	☐ Dominance Test is >50%
8	%	□ Prevalence Index is ≤3 0 ¹
9	<u>%</u>	
	<u>0 %</u> = Total Cover	Morphological Adaptations' (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30'</u>)	0/	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (explain)
1		1 le disetere effecterie e il en desettere d'herdere en
2	<u> </u>	must be present, unless disturbed or problematic
···	0 % = Total Cover	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?
Remarks (Include photo numbers here or on a separate she Photo E-3.	eet): No vegetation present. Sample plot lo	ocated in recently harvested row-crop agriculture field.

	Redox Features	
(inches) Color (moist) % C	olor (moist) % Type ¹ Loc ²	Texture Remarks
<u> </u>		Silt Loam
· ·		
Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Rec	Juced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains	² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix
Hydric Soil Indicators:		Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol (A1)	Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)	Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
Histic Epipedon (A2)	Sandy Redox (S5)	\square Dark Surface (S7)
Black Histic (A3)	Stripped Matrix (S6)	☐ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)	🗌 Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)	Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF 12)
Stratified Layers (A5)	Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)	☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)
2 cm Muck (A10)	Depleted Matrix (F3)	_ 、 ,
Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)	Redox Dark Surface (F6)	
Thick Dark Surface (A12)	Depleted Dark Surface (F7)	³ Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and
Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)	Redox Depressions (F8)	disturbed or problematic.
5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)		-
Restrictive Layer (if present):		Hydric Soil Present?
Type: frozen soil Depth	ı (inches): _2	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Remarks:No indicator is met		
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY		
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Netland Hydrology Indicators:		
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Netland Hydrology Indicators:	eck all that apply)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Netland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; chu	eck all that apply) □ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Netland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; chr Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2)	eck all that apply) U Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10)
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; chi Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3)	eck all that apply) U Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; chr Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1)	eck all that apply) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8)
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; chronology) Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) Sediment Deposits (B2)	eck all that apply) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; ch.) Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) Sediment Deposits (B2) Drift Deposits (B3)	eck all that apply) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; ch Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) Sediment Deposits (B2) Drift Deposits (B3) Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	eck all that apply) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) Geomorphic Position (D2)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; ch Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; ch Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) Sediment Deposits (B2) Drift Deposits (B3) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Iron Deposits (B5)	eck all that apply) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Thin Muck Surface (C7)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) Geomorphic Position (D2) FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Remarks:No indicator is met YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; ch Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) Sediment Deposits (B2) Drift Deposits (B3) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Iron Deposits (B5) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)	eck all that apply) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Gauge or Well Data (D9)	Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9 Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) Geomorphic Position (D2) FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

_ 1 , 0		()	— ()	,
Field Observations:	Yes	No	Depth (inches)	Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections, etc.), if available:
Surface Water present?		\boxtimes		
Water Table present?		\boxtimes		
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)		\boxtimes		
Wetland Hydrology Present?		\boxtimes		
Remarks: No indicators are pres	sent.			

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Deuel Harvest North Inter	connection	n Area Siting	g Study City/County: Deuel County Sampling Date: 11/14/2018			
Applicant/Owner: Deuel Harvest Wind	Energy LL	.C	State: SD Sampling Point: SP-4			
Investigator(s): J. Kensinger, B. Salup	0		Section, Township, Range: S24, T116N, R48W			
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.) Dep	ression		Local relief (concave, convex, none): <u>Concave</u> Slope (%): <u>4 %</u>			
Subregion (LRR): M			Lat: <u>44.84785</u> Long: <u>-96.542133</u> Datum: <u>NAD83</u>			
Soil Map Unit Name: Parnell-Vallers complex NWI Classification: N/A						
Are climate/hydrologic conditions on the	site typical	for this time	e of year? 🛛 Yes 🔤 No (If no, explain in Remarks)			
Vegetation	Soil	Hydrology	Are "Normal Circumstances" present? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No			
Significantly Disturbed?			(If needed, explain any answers in Remarks)			
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach	site map	showing	sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.			
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present? Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland	Yes ⊠ ⊠ I? ⊠	No 	Remarks: PEM (W-2). The Palmer Drought Severity Index indicates that the area is experiencing moderately moist climate/hydrologic conditions.			
VEGETATION – Use scientific nam	es of pla	nts				
Гree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30'</u>) 1 2 3		Abso C	Solute % Dominant Indicator Cover Species? Status %			
4						

<u>%</u> <u>%</u> <u>%</u>		Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: (B)
<u>%</u> <u>%</u>		_ Species Across All Strata:(B)
<u>%</u>		Dereent of Deminent Species
0 %		Percent of Dominant Species
0 70	= Total Cover	that are OBL, FACW, or FAC:(A/B)
		Prevalence Index Worksheet
%		-
%	<u> </u>	Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
		_ OBL species% x 1 =0
		_ FACW species% x 2 =
%	Tatal O	FAC species $\%$ x 3 = 0
0 %	= Total Cover	FACU species $\%$ x 4 = 0
		$\begin{array}{c} \text{OPL species} \\ \text{Column Totals:} \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0\% & x \ 5 = \underline{0} \\ 0\% & (A) \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0\% \\ (B) \\ \end{array}$
80 %	Y FACW	- (B)
<u> </u>	N FACW	Prevalence Index = B/A =
<u> </u>	<u>N</u> FAC	-
%		- Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	- Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
<u> </u>		Dominance Test is >50%
<u> </u>	·	Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
100 %	= Total Cover	 Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
0/		Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (explain)
%	·	
<u> % </u>		must be present, unless disturbed or problematic
0 %	= Total Cover	Hydrophytic Vegetation Bracent? Veg
	$ \begin{array}{c} $	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

	Matrix	I	Redox Fea	atures			
(inches)	Color (moist) %	6 Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture Rel	marks
·				·			
				·			
		RM-Reduced Matrix C	S=Cover	ad or Costed	Sand Grains	² l ocation: PL-Pore Lining M-M	atrix
Hydric Soil Indi			Indicators for Problematic Hydric S				
Histosol (A1) Histic Epiped Black Histic (, Hydrogen Su Stratified Lay 2 cm Muck (A Depleted Beld Thick Dark Si Sandy Mucky 5 cm Mucky F	on (A2) A3) Ifide (A4) ers (A5) \10) ow Dark Surface (A11) urface (A12) Mineral (S1) Peat or Peat (S3)	☐ Sandy Gl ☐ Sandy Re ☐ Stripped ☐ Loamy M ☐ Loamy G ☐ Depleted ☐ Redox De ☐ Redox De	eyed Matr adox (S5) Matrix (S6 ucky Mine leyed Mat Matrix (F3 ark Surfac Dark Surfac pressions	rix (S4) eral (F1) rix (F2) 3) e (F6) face (F7) s (F8)	 Coast Prairie Redox (A16) Dark Surface (S7) Iron-Manganese Masses (F12) Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF 12) Other (Explain in Remarks) ³ Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation a wetland hydrology must be present, in disturbed or problematic.) and unless	
Restrictive Laye	er (if present):					Hydric Soil Present?	
Type: Ice		Depth (inches):	ırface			Yes 🗌 No	

HYDROLOGY

Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply)						
	🗌 Water-Stair	ned Leaves (B9)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)			
	🗌 Aquatic Fa	una (B13)	🛛 Drainage Patterns (B10)			
	True Aquatic Plants (B14)		Dry-Season Water Table (C2)			
	🗌 Hydrogen S	Sulfide Odor (C1)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)			
	Oxidized R	hizospheres on Living Roots (C3)	Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)			
	Presence o	f Reduced Iron (C4)	Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)			
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)			Geomorphic Position (D2)			
	Thin Muck	Surface (C7)	🛛 FAC-Neutral Test (D5)			
ry (B7)	☐ Gauge or V	☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)				
ace (B8)	Other (Expla	Other (Explain in Remarks)				
Field Observations: Depth Yes No (inches)			Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections, etc.), if available:			
	surface					
	surface					
	surface					
ludes capillary fringe)						
D2, and I	05 are present.					
	equired; cl ery (B7) face (B8) s No 1	equired; check all that apply) Water-Stair Aquatic Fau True Aquat Hydrogen S Oxidized Ri Oxidized Ri Presence o Recent Iror Thin Muck i ery (B7) Gauge or V face (B8) Other (Explain S No (inches) Depth S No (inches) Depth S S Surface Surface Surface D2, and D5 are present.	equired; check all that apply) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Thin Muck Surface (C7) ery (B7) Gauge or Well Data (D9) face (B8) Other (Explain in Remarks) Depth Describe Recorded Data (stream of inspections, etc.), if available: Surface surface Surface present.			

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Deuel Harvest North Interconne	ection Area Siting	Study City/County: Deuel County Sampling Date: 11/14/2018		
Applicant/Owner: Deuel Harvest Wind Energ	gy LLC	State: <u>SD</u> Sampling Point: <u>SP-5</u>		
Investigator(s): J. Kensinger, B. Salupo		Section, Township, Range: <u>S24, T116N, R48W</u>		
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.) <u>Terrace</u>		Local relief (concave, convex, none): <u>Convex</u> Slope (%): <u>1 %</u>		
Subregion (LRR): M		Lat:		
Soil Map Unit Name: Forman-Aastad loams,	1 to 6 percent sl	opes NWI Classification: N/A		
Are climate/hydrologic conditions on the site ty	pical for this time	of year? 🛛 Yes 🔤 No (If no, explain in Remarks)		
Vegetation Soi Significantly Disturbed?	il Hydrology I □	Are "Normal Circumstances" present? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No		
Naturally Problematic?		(If needed, explain any answers in Remarks)		
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site r	map showing	sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.		
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes No □ ⊠	Remarks: Upland sample plot adjacent PEM (W-2). The Palmer Drought Severity Index indicates that the area is experiencing moderately moist climate/hydrologic		
Hydric Soil Present?		conditions.		
Wetland Hydrology Present?				
Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?				
VEGETATION – Use scientific names of	f plants			

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')	Absolute % Dominant Indicator	Dominance Test Worksheet:
1.	%	Number of Dominant Species
2.	<u> </u>	that are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)
3.	<u> </u>	Total Number of Dominant
4.	%	Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)
5	<u>%</u>	Percent of Dominant Species
	<u> 0 %</u> = Total Cover	that are OBL, FACW, or FAC:0% (A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>15'</u>)		Prevalence Index Worksheet:
1	<u>%</u>	
2	<u>%</u>	Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
3	%	OBL species% x 1 =
4	%	FACW species% x 2 =0
5	<u>%</u>	FAC species% x 3 =
	<u>0 %</u> = Total Cover	FACU species% x 4 =
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')		UPL species% x 5 =
1. <u>Bromus inermis</u>	<u>100 % Y FACU</u>	Column Totals: <u>0</u> % (A) <u>0</u> (B)
2	<u>%</u>	Prevalence Index = B/A =
3	%	
4	<u>%</u>	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
5	%	
6	%	Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7	%	Dominance Test is >50%
8	<u>%</u> <u> </u>	☐ Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
9	<u> </u>	
	<u>100 %</u> = Total Cover	data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30'</u>)		Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (explain)
1	%	
2	%	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology
3	%	must be present, unless disturbed or problematic
	<u> 0 %</u> = Total Cover	Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? 🗌 Yes 🛛 No
Demortes (la chida ab sta complete a base an		
Remarks (include photo numbers here or on a separate	sneet): NO LESIS PASSED. Photo E-5.	

(inches) Color (moist) % Color (moist) % Type ¹ Loc 0-20 10YR 2/2 100 % Type ¹ Loc	 Toxturo Pomarka		
0-20 10YR 2/2 100			
	Silty Clay Loam		
	· ·		
¹ Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand C	ains ² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix		
Hydric Soil Indicators:	Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :		
Histosol (A1) Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)	Coast Prairie Redox (A16)		
Histic Epipedon (A2)	\Box Dark Surface (S7)		
Black Histic (A3)	☐ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)		
Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)	Verv Shallow Dark Surface (TF 12)		
Stratified Layers (A5) Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)	Other (Explain in Remarks)		
2 cm Muck (A10) Depleted Matrix (F3)			
Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)			
Thick Dark Surface (A12) Depleted Dark Surface (F7)	³ Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and		
□ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) □ Redox Depressions (F8)	wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic		
5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)			
Restrictive Layer (if present):	Hydric Soil Present?		
Type: Depth (inches):	□ Yes ⊠ No		
Remarks: No indicator is present.			
IYDROLOGY			

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply)					Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)	
Surface Water (A1)			UWater-Stain	ed Leaves (B9)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)	
☐ High Water Table (A2)			🗌 Aquatic Fau	ına (B13)	Drainage Patterns (B10)	
Saturation (A3)	Saturation (A3)			c Plants (B14)	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)	
☐ Water Marks (B1)			🗌 Hydrogen S	ulfide Odor (C1)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)	
Sediment Deposits (B2)	Sediment Deposits (B2)			nizospheres on Living Roots (C3)	Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)	
Drift Deposits (B3)			Presence of	f Reduced Iron (C4)	Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)	
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)			Recent Iron	Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Geomorphic Position (D2)	
☐ Iron Deposits (B5)			Thin Muck S	Surface (C7)	☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)	
☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)			☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)			
Sparsely Vegetated Concave	Surface	e (B8)	Other (Explain in Remarks)			
Field Observations:			Depth	Depth Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous		
	Yes	No	(inches)	inspections, etc.), if available:		
Surface Water present?		\boxtimes				
Water Table present?		\boxtimes				
Saturation Present?		\boxtimes				
(includes capillary fringe)						
Wetland Hydrology Present?		\boxtimes				
Remarks: No indicators are pres	ent.					

APPENDIX E - WETLAND DELINEATION PHOTOSHEET

Photograph E-1: View of upland Sample Plot (SP)-1, facing east.

Photograph E-2: View of SP-2 in PEM Wetland (W)-1, facing north.

Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm Interconnection Area Siting Study Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC

SURNS M⊆DONNELL Wetland Delineation Photographs November 14, 2018 Deuel County, SD

Photograph E-3: View of upland SP-3, facing west.

Photograph E-4: View of SP-4 in PEM W-2, facing north.

Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm Interconnection Area Siting Study Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC

Wetland Delineation Photographs November 14, 2018 Deuel County, SD

