

Town of Kingston  
Senior Center Building Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
March 14, 2007

---

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m. by Chairman, Paul Gallagher. Other members present were Muriel Boyce, Phil Burnham, Jack Burrey, and Linda Felix. Absent were Ron Gleason and Dave Colter.
  
2. Paul handed out copies of a letter and pictures from the BSC Group to Kevin Donovan dated February 28, 2007 (copy attached) and received by that office on March 1, 2007, which was developed by their survey undertaken at the request of the Committee in a Motion made at the January 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting (see item #19) to go ahead with their contract/letter regarding their bid on this survey project. Paul also had a copy of the site plan on the land they surveyed - Map 35. Lots 27, 28, and 56.
  
3. Jack Burrey commented that he did a walk-through but the land which we could probably use ( a 6 acre piece ) is really further back than what their Survey described and what showed on the above mentioned site plan. There are numerous wetland areas on these mentioned lots, but as stated above, their Survey did not cover all of the land that we thought they would be surveying. There are also a few vernal pools on these lots that need to be viewed in the Spring for any endangered species. Looking back, this bid for this project was much lower than the other bid received (\$19,600 vs. \$34,200) but turned out not to be as complete as we had expected it to be. The higher bid was rejected for other reasons.
  
4. Paul then suggested that maybe we could buy and sell some abutting Town property and end up with that which the Town actually owns. Also, he mentioned that there is land behind and beyond these lots as shown on the site plan now that might be deemed buildable but may not be worth investigating any further especially in light of all the new amount of wetlands found on the land that was surveyed. Proximity to Bates Pond also needs to be considered further.
  
5. Paul continued that he thought we should move forward and if the decision is that these pieces of land have just too much wetlands, then perhaps the land should be reclassified as "Open Space" to be added to what other Open Space we now have. He also feels that these sites are too far out and up from the original site we had considered for the new Senior Center.

6. One of the other members asked, "where do we stand on the McFarlane property? Paul went on to explain how they may be using CPA funds to buy the McFarlane property. It is appraised and they are asking \$1.8 million for these 21 acres. He continued that it may not pay to buy it for this amount but if the proposal is to buy those acres for \$1.8 million, Town Meeting approval would be needed and we would need to get approval from the Town to borrow money and that would then limit the amount of money we could get from the CPA. If the CPA tax gets voted down from the present 3% to 1% , we could probably only buy the McFarlane acreage that is located on Rt. 27. The cost per acre is roughly \$90,000 per acre; e.g. for 4 acres, it would be \$360,000 and the CPA could sell us just that amount of acreage and we would then apply for the Bond. We might be able to give up \$360,000 from the \$3.0M we now have available for the Senior Center and it might just be that we could do that. Somebody by the name of Earl Zahn has property for sale and we will know more by April 9 but we do know that these people have offers of over \$2.0 million. (The Committee did express some concerns with the above thoughts on these pieces of land and Phil Burnham said he had some specific reservations as well.)

7. At this point and in view of above discussions tonight, a Motion was made to appoint Jack Burrey, Vice Chairman, as the spokesman for the Senior Center Building Committee at the Annual Town Meeting on April 9<sup>th</sup> on the subject of the McFarlane properties and the building of the Senior Center. The **Motion** was made by Phil Burnham and **seconded** by Muriel Boyce and it was **so Voted**. Paul stated that the ATM would no doubt be a full evening on Monday, the 9<sup>th</sup>, and more than likely also on the evening of Tuesday, the 10<sup>th</sup>.

8. Paul went on to say that he thought we should set our next meeting for Wednesday, March 28<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. and also one for April 4<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. as well as posting one for 6:30 p.m. just prior to the ATM at 7:00 p.m. on the 9<sup>th</sup> and Ruthann will post all three within the next few days. (The one at 6:30 p.m. will be posted to continue on at KIS at the ATM if necessary until the ATM is adjourned.) Phil Burnham mentioned that he would not be available for at least one of the first two meetings mentioned above but wanted it known of his reservations on item #6 above if he is indeed absent at one or both meetings and we do take under consideration a Vote on these matters.

9. Paul is going to investigate further several items on the land mentioned in item

#4 above, including the location of Bates Pond and Pathways on those properties whereas the BSC Group did not cover parts of the land we had hoped he would have and also did not delineate Map 35, Lot 54 and any Town-owned property beyond that.

10. A **Motion** was made by Phil Burnham and **seconded** by Linda Felix to accept the Minutes of the January 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting as presented and it was **so Voted**.

11. Muriel Boyce wanted the Committee to know that the Friends of the Council on Aging, the fund raising arm of the Council of Aging, have sent in an application on behalf of Emily Felix's community involvement to the "New England Patriot's Community MVP Award" for an individual who exemplifies leadership, dedication and commitment to the community in which they live through outstanding volunteer work. It is a 4-page nominee/application - describing the outstanding work she has done, how this work affected the lives of others in the community, describes her strong commitment to community service and describes a situation that would set Emily apart from others, why she is deserving of the award and what challenges did she face. There will be 21 winners and the prizes run from \$1,500 to \$10,000 and would go to the non-profit organization for which Emily volunteered. The Committee wished Emily well in this endeavor and for all her hard work on behalf of the Senior Center and the COA.

12. There being no other business to come before the Committee, a **Motion** was made by Jack Burrey and **seconded** by Paul Gallagher to adjourn the meeting, it being 8:20 p.m and it was **so Voted**.

Respectfully submitted,



Ruthann Cassidy, Secretary

att.



February 28, 2007

Mr. Kevin Donovan  
Office of the Board of Selectmen  
Kingston Town House  
26 Evergreen Street  
Kingston, MA 02464

**Subject: Wetland Resource Area Identification  
Evergreen Street, Kingston, MA**

Dear Mr. Donovan:

1 MAR 2007 PM 1:42

The BSC Group is pleased to submit this summary report describing the wetland resource areas for the 28-acre site (Assessors Map 35, Lots 27, 28, and 56) along Evergreen Street in Kingston, MA (Site). Wetland resource areas were identified as per the Federal Clean Water Act and the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (M.G.L Chapter 131, Section 40) (MWPA) and Regulations (310 CMR 10.00), and were delineated using the methodologies set forth by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (1987 Manual) and in the Massachusetts Wetland Delineation Methodology (DEP Policy 95-1). The Town of Kingston has a local wetlands protection bylaw, which regulates a 100-foot buffer zone for vernal pools (as defined in Chapter 13 Article 2.D of the bylaw, in addition to the definitions found in the regulations under the Wetlands Protection Act). The bylaw also regulates a 100-foot buffer for land subject to flooding in addition to the 100-foot buffer zone provided to bordering vegetated wetlands, isolated land subject to flooding, and inland bank by the state Act.

The resource areas identified by BSC include bordering vegetated wetland (MWPA), and areas that are probably too small to be classified as isolated land subject to flooding (MWPA), but that could potentially be defined as Waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or as isolated vegetated wetlands or vernal pools under the town bylaw. Data forms were completed for representative wetland areas (MADEP BVW field data sheets) and have been included as an attachment to this letter along with photographs.

BSC reviewed available existing conditions information for the Site. According to the 1969 National Resource Conservation Service soil survey for Plymouth County, Massachusetts, the soils of a large portion of the site are classified as Scarboro Series sandy loam. Soils within this series are very poorly drained sandy loams that formed in thick deposits of sand or sand and gravel, and are principally wooded with red maple (*Acer rubrum*). These soils have a black mucky layer overlying a sandy loam layer and a gray, mottled loamy sand layer. They are wet most of the time because of a high water table. No 100-year flood zones (FEMA Q3 data layer, MassGIS website) or estimated or priority endangered species habitat (as defined by the Natural

33 Waldo Street  
Worcester, MA  
01608

Tel: 508-792-4500  
Fax: 508-792-4509

Engineers

Environmental  
Scientists

GIS Consultants

Landscape  
Architects

Planners

Surveyors



Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP), Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife) occur on the site. However, Bates Pond was mapped as a potential vernal pool by NHESP.

To demarcate the upland/wetland boundary in the field, BSC scientists placed sequentially numbered flagging tape. These flag points were located via conventional survey and are shown on the Project Plans. The following paragraphs present each wetland resource area flagged, its jurisdictional classification, and provide a brief summary of its existing conditions.

Four wetland areas were flagged and are described below.

Wetland 1 (Isolated Vegetated Wetland/Potential Vernal Pool)

Wetland 1 is an isolated vegetated wetland (IVW), which appears to be separated from Wetland 2 by an existing dirt road. This wetland is forested, and has the potential to function as a vernal pool. The majority of the surrounding upland consists of maintained dirt road/staging area and paved parking lot. Dominant woody species in the wetland include red maple, pin oak (*Quercus palustris*), pepperbush (*Clethra alnifolia*), and common green briar (*Smilax rotundifolia*). The soils in the wetland consist of a thick organic layer with sandy subsoil. Standing water was observed within 7 inches of the surface of the mineral soil, and the soil was saturated to the surface. The wetland receives drainage from the surrounding areas, and may have a groundwater connection to the adjacent BVW. This area may have the potential to dry up in certain years and should be investigated in the spring for the presence of vernal pool indicators.

Based on preliminary investigation, this wetland appears to meet the size requirements to qualify as Isolated Land Subject to Flooding (ILSF) under the MWPA. This wetland area is subject to jurisdiction under the local wetlands bylaw as either an isolated vegetated wetland and/or as a vernal pool. To determine its status as a vernal pool, additional investigations need to be completed to verify the presence/absence of breeding amphibians in the spring. Finally, due to its proximity to other wetlands and its characteristics, this area is subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Clean Water Act as administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). This resource area has a 100-foot buffer zone associated with it.

Wetland 2 (Bordering Vegetated Wetland)

Wetland 2 is a large BVW that covers a majority of the undeveloped portions of the Site. It includes Bates Pond and an intermittent stream (not mapped on the USGS quadrangle) that lies within the interior of the BVW. There is an interior pocket of marsh, but the majority of the wetland is forested swamp. An old highbush blueberry farm is within the southern edge of the wetland. The wetland drains off-site from a culvert under the commuter rail line at the northern edge of the Site. The dominant vegetation consists of red maple, white oak (*Quercus alba*), pepperbush, highbush blueberry (*Vaccinium corymbosum*), and common green briar. The soils in this area have a mucky layer underlain by sandy subsoil.



This wetland meets the criteria to qualify as a Bordering Vegetated Wetland under the MWPA. This wetland area is subject to jurisdiction under the local wetlands bylaw as a Freshwater Wetland. Finally, due to its proximity to Bates Pond and its characteristics, this area can be classified as Waters of the United States and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Clean Water Act as administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). This resource area has a 100-foot buffer zone associated with it.

*Wetlands 3 and 4 (Isolated Vegetated Wetlands/Potential Vernal Pools)*


Wetlands 3 and 4 are small, isolated depressions that were inundated at the time of investigation. Wetland 3 is at the northeastern edge of the site, bordered by the commuter rail line to the north and a DPW organic materials stockpile area to the south. The wetland is dominated by buttonbush (*Cephalanthus occidentalis*). The soils are dark, coarse sands. The basin was flooded, and standing water was observed at a depth of 4 inches in the soil pit. Wetland 4 is located at the southwestern corner of the Site. Vegetation at the edge of the basin is dominated by pepperbush and green briar. The soils in this wetland have a mucky surface layer with sandy subsoil. Both of these areas are potential vernal pools and should be investigated again in the spring for vernal pool indicators.

Based on preliminary investigations, these wetlands do not appear to meet the size requirements to qualify as Isolated Land Subject to Flooding (ILSF) under the MWPA, but would require additional investigations to verify. These wetland areas are subject to jurisdiction under the local wetlands bylaw as either isolated vegetated wetlands and/or as a vernal pools. To determine their status as vernal pools, additional investigations need to be completed to verify the presence/absence of breeding amphibians in the spring. Finally, due to their characteristics and proximity to other wetlands, these areas may be classified as Waters of the United States and may be subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Clean Water Act as administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). These resource areas have a 100-foot buffer zone associated with them.

In conclusion, we identified four wetland resource areas on the site. Based on the physical characteristics of the isolated wetlands, we suggest that these areas be evaluated further for the presence of vernal pool species in the spring. BSC would be happy to provide further assistance in this matter. If you have any questions or would like more information, please contact Marc Bergeron or me at 508-792-4500.

Sincerely,  
BSC Group, Inc.,

Susan Infalt  
Wetland Scientist



Isolated Vegetated Wetland/Potential Vernal Pool (Wetland 1)  
Photo on the left was taken facing south. Photo on the right was taken facing east.



Bordering Vegetated Wetland (Wetland 2)  
Photo on the left shows Bates Pond. Photo on the right was taken at the northeastern edge of the wetland.



Bordering Vegetated Wetland (Wetland 2)

Photo on the left was taken at the northeastern portion of the wetland, facing south. Photo on the right was taken at the northwestern portion of the wetland, facing southeast.



Isolated Vegetated Wetlands/Potential Vernal Pools (Wetlands 3 and 4)

Photo on the left is of Wetland 3. Photo on the right is of Wetland 4



**DEP Bordering Vegetated Wetland (310 CMR 10.55) Delineation Field Data Form**

Applicant Town of Kingston Prepared by: BSC Group

Project Location  
Kingston, MA

Check all that apply:

- Vegetation alone presumed adequate to delineate BVW boundary: fill out Section I only
- Vegetation and other indications of hydrology used to delineate BVW boundary: fill out sections I and II
- Method other than dominance test used (attach additional information)

Section I. Vegetation	Transect 1	Plot U	Date 1/16/07	Transect near WF 1-1	
<b>A. Sample Layer and Plant Species</b>		<b>B. Basal Area (or percent cover)</b>	<b>C. Percent Dominance</b>	<b>D. Dominant Plant</b>	
				<b>Wetland Indicator Status</b>	
Trees					
White pine ( <i>Pinus strobus</i> )		10.5/10.5	100.0%	Y	FACU
Saplings					
Red oak ( <i>Quercus rubra</i> )		3.0/3.0	100.0%	NA	FACU-
Shrubs					
White pine ( <i>Pinus strobus</i> )		10.5/10.5	100.0%	Y	FACU
Herbaceous					
Goldenrod ( <i>Solidago</i> sp)		3.0/3.0	100.0%	NA	NA
Vines					

\* Use an asterisk to mark wetland indicator plants: plant species listed in the Wetlands Protection Act (MGL c. 131, s. 40); plants in the genus Sphagnum; plants listed as FAC, FAC+, FACW-, FACW, FACW+, or OBL; or plants with physiological or morphological adaptations. If any plants are identified as wetland indicator plants due to physiological or morphological adaptations, describe the adaptation next to the asterisk.

**Vegetation Conclusion**

Number of dominant wetland indicator plants: 0

Number of dominant non-wetland indicator plants: 2

**Is the number of dominant wetland plants equal to or greater than the number of dominant non-wetland plants? No**

If vegetation alone is presumed adequate to delineate the BVW boundary, submit this form with the Request for Determination of Applicability or Notice of Intent.

**Section II. Indicators of Hydrology**

<b>Hydric Soil Interpretation</b>					<b>Other Indicators of Hydrology (check all that apply)</b>				
1. Soil Survey					Site inundated?				
Is there a published soil survey for this site? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No					Depth to free water in observation hole:				
title/date: Plymouth County, Massachusetts 1969					Depth to soil saturation in observation hole:				
map number: 27					Water lines:				
soil type mapped: Carver series					Drift Marks:				
hydric soil inclusions:					Sediment Deposits:				
Are field observations consistent with soil survey? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No					Drainage Patterns in BVW:				
Remarks: Area disturbed (filled road)					Oxidized Rhizospheres:				
2. Soil Description					Water Stained Leaves:				
Recorded data (stream, tidal gauge; aerial photo; other)									
Horizon	Depth	Matrix	Texture	Mottles	Other:				
Fill	0-8+"	10YR 6/4	sand		Number of wetland plants > than number of non-wetland plants? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
					Wetland hydrology present:				
					hydric soil <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
					other indicators <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
3. Other Area disturbed; compacted road					Sample plot is in a BVW <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Is soil hydric? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No									





**DEP Bordering Vegetated Wetland (310 CMR 10.55) Delineation Field Data Form**

Applicant Town of Kingston Prepared by: BSC Group

Project Location

Check all that apply:

Kingston, MA

- Vegetation alone presumed adequate to delineate BVW boundary: fill out Section I only
- Vegetation and other indications of hydrology used to delineate BVW boundary: fill out sections I and II
- Method other than dominance test used (attach additional information)

Section I. Vegetation	Transect 3	Plot W	Date 1/16/07	Transect near WF 2-41	
A. Sample Layer and Plant Species	B. Basal Area (or percent cover)		C. Percent Dominance	D. Dominant Plant	Wetland Indicator Status
Trees					
Red maple ( <i>Acer rubrum</i> )	38.0/51.5		74.0%	Y	FAC*
White oak ( <i>Quercus alba</i> )	10.5/51.5		20.0%	Y	FACU-
White pine ( <i>Pinus strobus</i> )	3.0/51.5		6.0%	N	FACU
Saplings					
White pine ( <i>Pinus strobus</i> )	3.0/6.0		50.0%	Y	FACU
Red maple ( <i>Acer rubrum</i> )	3.0/6.0		50.0%	Y	FAC*
Shrubs					
Pepperbush ( <i>Clethra alnifolia</i> )	10.5/21		50.0%	Y	FAC+*
Highbush blueberry ( <i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i> )	10.5/21		50.0%	Y	FACW-*
Herbaceous					
Tree clubmoss ( <i>Lycopodium obscurum</i> )	3.0/3.0		100.0%	N	FACU
Vines					
Green briar ( <i>Smilax rotundifolia</i> )	3.0/3.0		100.0%	N	FAC*

\* Use an asterisk to mark wetland indicator plants: plant species listed in the Wetlands Protection Act (MGL c. 131, s. 40); plants in the genus Sphagnum; plants listed as FAC, FAC+, FACW-, FACW+, or OBL; or plants with physiological or morphological adaptations. If any plants are identified as wetland indicator plants due to physiological or morphological adaptations, describe the adaptation next to the asterisk.

**Vegetation Conclusion**

Number of dominant wetland indicator plants: 4

Number of dominant non-wetland indicator plants: 2

**Is the number of dominant wetland plants equal to or greater than the number of dominant non-wetland plants? Yes**

If vegetation alone is presumed adequate to delineate the BVW boundary, submit this form with the Request for Determination of Applicability or Notice of Intent.

**Section II. Indicators of Hydrology**

Other Indicators of Hydrology (check all that apply)

Hydric Soil Interpretation					Site inundated?
1. Soil Survey					Depth to free water in observation hole:
Is there a published soil survey for this site? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No					Depth to soil saturation in observation hole:
title/date: Plymouth County, Massachusetts 1969					Water lines:
map number: 27					Drift Marks:
soil type mapped: Scarboro series					Sediment Deposits:
hydric soil inclusions:					Drainage Patterns in BVW:
Are field observations consistent with soil survey? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No					Oxidized Rhizospheres:
Remarks:					Water Stained Leaves:
2. Soil Description					Recorded data (stream, tidal gauge; aerial photo; other)
Horizon	Depth	Matrix	Texture	Mottles	
Oi	1-0"				Other:
A	0-1"	10YR 2/1	mucky		
B1	1-6"	10YR 5/1	fine sand		
B2	6-10"	10YR 3/2		10YR 4/4	Number of wetland plants > than number of non-wetland plants? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
B3	10-12+"	10YR 2/2	clay		Wetland hydrology present:
					hydric soil <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
					other indicators <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
3. Other					Sample plot is in a BVW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Is soil hydric? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No					

**DEP Bordering Vegetated Wetland (310 CMR 10.55) Delineation Field Data Form**

Applicant Town of Kingston Prepared by: BSC Group

Project Location

Check all that apply:

Kingston, MA

- Vegetation alone presumed adequate to delineate BVW boundary: fill out Section I only
- Vegetation and other indications of hydrology used to delineate BVW boundary: fill out sections I and II
- Method other than dominance test used (attach additional information)

Section I. Vegetation	Transect 3	Plot U	Date 1/16/07	Transect near WF 2-41	
<b>A. Sample Layer and Plant Species</b>		<b>B. Basal Area (or percent cover)</b>	<b>C. Percent Dominance</b>	<b>D. Dominant Plant</b>	<b>Wetland Indicator Status</b>
Trees					
White pine ( <i>Pinus strobus</i> )		38.0/48.5	78.0% Y		FACU
Red maple ( <i>Acer rubrum</i> )		10.5/48.5	22.0% Y		FAC*
Saplings					
White pine ( <i>Pinus strobus</i> )		10.5/21	50.0% Y		FACU
Red maple ( <i>Acer rubrum</i> )		10.5/21	50.0% Y		FAC*
Shrubs					
Highbush blueberry ( <i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i> )		38.0/38	100.0% Y		FACW-*
Herbaceous					
Cinnamon fern ( <i>Osmunda cinnamomea</i> )		3.0/6.0	50.0% Y		FACW*
Tree clubmoss ( <i>Lycopodium obscurum</i> )		3.0/6.0	50.0% Y		FACU
Vines					
Green briar ( <i>Smilax rotundifolia</i> )		38.0/38	100.0% Y		FAC*

\* Use an asterisk to mark wetland indicator plants: plant species listed in the Wetlands Protection Act (MGL c. 131, s. 40); plants in the genus Sphagnum; plants listed as FAC, FAC+, FACW-, FACW, FACW+, or OBL; or plants with physiological or morphological adaptations. If any plants are identified as wetland indicator plants due to physiological or morphological adaptations, describe the adaptation next to the asterisk.

**Vegetation Conclusion**

Number of dominant wetland indicator plants: 5

Number of dominant non-wetland indicator plants: 3

**Is the number of dominant wetland plants equal to or greater than the number of dominant non-wetland plants? Yes**

If vegetation alone is presumed adequate to delineate the BVW boundary, submit this form with the Request for Determination of Applicability or Notice of Intent.

**Section II. Indicators of Hydrology**

Other Indicators of Hydrology (check all that apply)

Hydric Soil Interpretation	Site inundated?															
1. Soil Survey	Depth to free water in observation hole:															
Is there a published soil survey for this site? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Depth to soil saturation in observation hole:															
title/date: Plymouth County, Massachusetts 1969	Water lines:															
map number: 27	Drift Marks:															
soil type mapped: Carver series	Sediment Deposits:															
hydric soil inclusions:	Drainage Patterns in BVW:															
Are field observations consistent with soil survey? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Oxidized Rhizospheres:															
Remarks:	Water Stained Leaves:															
2. Soil Description	Recorded data (stream, tidal gauge; aerial photo; other)															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Horizon</th> <th>Depth</th> <th>Matrix</th> <th>Texture</th> <th>Mottles</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>0-5"</td> <td>10YR 2/1</td> <td>sandy loam</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>5-18"</td> <td>10YR 4/6</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Horizon	Depth	Matrix	Texture	Mottles	A	0-5"	10YR 2/1	sandy loam		B	5-18"	10YR 4/6			Other:
Horizon	Depth	Matrix	Texture	Mottles												
A	0-5"	10YR 2/1	sandy loam													
B	5-18"	10YR 4/6														
	Number of wetland plants > than number of non-wetland plants? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No															
	Wetland hydrology present:															
	hydric soil <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No															
	other indicators <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No															
3. Other	Sample plot is in a BVW <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No															
Is soil hydric? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No																