

WETLAND AND STREAM CRITICAL AREAS REPORT

Parcels 19588, 19589, 19590, 19591, 19592, 19593,
443233, 493233
Thorp Hwy North / Thorp Depot Rd / Goodwin Rd
Kittitas County, Washington

Prepared for:

Jeff Greear

1410 W Dolarway Road, Suite 301 | Ellensburg, WA 98926
509-607-3235 | jeff@centralpavingllc.com

Prepared by:

GG Environmental

Geoffrey Gray, MA, PWS
151 Poulin Rd. Selah, WA 98942
gg@gg-env.com | (509) 426-5645

May 17, 2022



GG Environmental

WETLANDS • FISH • WILDLIFE

This page is purposefully blank.

Summary

On May 10, 2022, Geoffrey Gray, MA, PWS (GG Environmental) completed a wetland and stream critical areas investigation for Kittitas County parcels 19588, 19589, 19590, 19591, 19592, 19593, 443233, and 493233 (“project footprint”), northwest of the intersection of Thorp Highway North and Thorp Depot Road, south of Goodwin Road, in unincorporated Kittitas County, Washington. The investigation included all areas within a 250-foot (ft) radius of the parcel boundaries (“study area”).

The study area has been flood irrigated and managed for hay and pasture since at least 1954, although this practice likely began decades earlier. Water arrives via the West Side Canal upgradient of the study area. Water is released from the canal and is distributed across the landscape via a complex network of irrigation ditches, irrigation swales, lateral dikes, culverts, and gated pipes that collectively deliver surface water, via gravity flow, onto otherwise dry land. Irrigation was active during the investigation with irrigation ditches flowing and water being flooded across the northern portion of the study area and onto fields upgradient to the west.

The soils mapped within the project footprint are well-drained and not characterized as hydric soils. Depth to groundwater is listed at 30 to over 80 inches (in) depending on location. Irrigation water flooded across the landscape infiltrates into the soil profile, serving to raise the groundwater level. Dominant soil units mapped upgradient of the study area exhibit a depth to impervious duripan from 20 to 40 in. As such, irrigation water applied upgradient of the study area likely results in hyporheic flow that contributes toward downgradient groundwater elevations.

Vegetation on irrigated land consists of cultivated hay and pasture grasses. Irrigation ditch banks and bottoms within the study area are dominated by non-native reed canarygrass with stands of poison hemlock (Kittitas County Class A Noxious Weed) and small patches of cattails. Infiltration from irrigation ditches along the west boundary supports a band of woody vegetation along the ditches, colonized by a variety of native shrubs and trees, including both upland species and species typically associated with wetlands.

Based upon best available science, the vicinity was likely xeric, lacking wetlands, prior to the advent of irrigation. Observed hydrology within the study area is best explained by ongoing irrigation practices. The artificial management of irrigation water on uplands can support wetland vegetation and result in hydric soil indicators, especially in the bottoms of irrigation ditches and irrigation swales. However, according to the Kittitas County (county) Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) Sections 17A.02.840 and 17A.07.020(1), *wetlands do not include those artificial wetlands intentionally created from non-wetland sites, including, but not limited to, irrigation and drainage ditches, grass-lined swales, canals, detention facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, farm ponds, and landscape amenities.* Although these irrigation-related features may delineate as *biological* wetlands, they are not regulated by the county. Based upon best available science, no jurisdictional wetlands are present within the study area.



The county maps an unnamed Type 2 (F) (fish-bearing) stream along the south shoulder of Goodwin Road for which it assigns a regulatory buffer of 100 feet (ft)¹ per CAO Section 17A.04.030 – *Riparian Management Zones and Buffers* plus a 15-ft building setback per CAO 17A.01.090(4) – *Building Setbacks*. No other streams are mapped within the study area.

The northeast corner of the study area intersects the mapped FEMA² floodplain and channel migration zone of the Yakima River.

¹ For the Columbia Plateau Ecoregion

² Federal Emergency Management Agency



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Location..... | 1 |
| 3. Methods | 2 |
| 3.1. Project Footprint and Study Area | 2 |
| 3.2. Background Research..... | 3 |
| 3.3. Field Investigation..... | 4 |
| 3.4. Wetland Delineation Guidance, Regulatory Jurisdiction | 4 |
| 3.5. Geospatial Documentation..... | 4 |
| 4. Existing Conditions | 4 |
| 4.1. Topography | 4 |
| 4.2. Geology..... | 4 |
| 4.3. Soils..... | 5 |
| 4.3.1. Soils mapped upon glacial drift | 5 |
| 4.3.2. Soils mapped within the project footprint | 5 |
| 4.4. Irrigation Regime | 6 |
| 4.5. Plants | 7 |
| 4.6. Precipitation and Hydrology..... | 7 |
| 4.7. Growing Season | 7 |
| 4.8. Mapped Wetlands..... | 7 |
| 4.9. Mapped Streams..... | 7 |
| 4.10. 100-year Floodplain and Channel Migration Zone..... | 8 |
| 5. Findings and Discussion..... | 8 |
| 5.1. Wetlands..... | 8 |
| 5.2. Streams..... | 8 |
| 5.3. Floodplain and Channel Migration Zone..... | 9 |
| 6. Limitations..... | 9 |
| 7. Consultant Qualifications | 10 |
| 8. References | 11 |



Figures

| | |
|--|---|
| Figure 1. Project Location | 1 |
| Figure 2. USGS Topographic Map | 2 |
| Figure 3. Project Footprint and Study Area | 3 |
| Figure 4. Irrigation Regime..... | 6 |

Appendices

| | |
|---|----|
| Appendix A. Background Information..... | 13 |
| Appendix A-1. USFWS NWI and Kittitas County Wetlands..... | 15 |
| Appendix A-2. NRCS Soil Survey Map | 17 |
| Appendix A-3. 1954 Historic Aerial Image..... | 19 |
| Appendix A-4. Kittitas County Stream Map and Regulatory Buffer..... | 21 |
| Appendix A-5. USGS 1902 Topographic Map and NHD..... | 23 |
| Appendix A-6. FEMA Floodplain and CMZ..... | 25 |
| Appendix B. Precipitation Analysis | 27 |
| Appendix C. Photos | 29 |



Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--|
| AgACIS | Agricultural Applied Climate Information System |
| CAO | Critical Areas Ordinance |
| Corps | United States Army Corps of Engineers |
| CMZ | Channel migration zone |
| County | Kittitas County |
| DNR | Washington State Department of Natural Resources |
| Ecology | Washington State Department of Ecology |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GNSS | Global Navigation Satellite System |
| GPS | Global Positioning System |
| LIDAR | Light Detection and Ranging |
| NHD | National Hydrography Dataset |
| NRCS | Natural Resources Conservation Service |
| NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration |
| NWI | National Wetlands Inventory |
| PWS | Professional Wetland Scientist |
| USDA | United States Department of Agriculture |
| USFWS | United States Fish and Wildlife Service |
| USGS | United States Geological Survey |
| WDFW | Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| WETS | Climate Analysis for Wetlands Tables |
| WGS84 | World Geodetic System 1984 |



This page is purposefully blank.



1. Introduction

GG Environmental (Geoffrey Gray, MA, PWS) was retained by Jeff Grear (client) to complete a wetland and stream critical areas investigation for parcels 19588, 19589, 19590, 19591, 19592, 19593, 443233, and 493233 in unincorporated Kittitas County (county), Washington (project).

2. Location

The project is located between Thorp and Interstate 90, northwest of the intersection of Thorp Highway North and Thorp Depot Road and south of Goodwin Road (**Figure 1**). Ranging in elevation from 1,624 to 1,652 feet (ft) (Google 2022), topography is generally sloped at less than one percent toward the east (**Figure 2**). Positioned within the SE ¼ of section 11 in Township 18 North, Range 17 East, the approximate center of the project footprint is located at latitude 47°3'41.85" North and longitude 120°40'23.00" West (WGS84).

Figure 1. Project Location





Figure 2. USGS Topographic Map



The project occurs within United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Land Resource Region B and USDA Major Land Resource Area 8 (Columbia Plateau) (NRCS 2006), Water Resource Inventory Area 39 (Upper Yakima), and Robinson Creek-Yakima River subwatershed (12th Hydrologic Unit Code 170300010507).


3. Methods

An overview of the methods employed to investigate wetlands and streams is presented in this section.

3.1. Project Footprint and Study Area

The project footprint is limited to land within the parcel boundaries. The study area includes the project footprint as well as a 250-foot (ft) radius from the project footprint consistent with county Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) Section 17A.07.060(2)(a) – Reporting/Contents (Kittitas County 2022a) (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Project Footprint and Study Area



3.2. Background Research

Available data for the study area, including information on soils, topography, vegetation, precipitation, wetlands, streams, floodplains, CMZ, LIDAR, historic aerial imagery, irrigation history and infrastructure, and the county code were researched:

- National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) (USFWS 2022a) (**Appendix A-1**);
- Kittitas County Code (Kittitas County 2022a);
- Kittitas County COMPAS (Kittitas County 2022b);
- Wetlands and Plants of High Conservation Value (DNR 2022a);
- NRCS soil survey data (NRCS 2022a) (**Appendix A-2**);
- AgACIS climate data (NRCS 2022b). (**Appendix B**);
- USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) (USGS 2022a);
- USGS historic topographic maps (USGS 2022b);
- Historic aerial photography: 1954 (CWU 2022) (**Appendix A-3**) and 1985-2021 (Google 2022);
- Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) data (DNR 2022b);
- Washington Geologic Information Portal (DNR 2022c).

3.3. Field Investigation

Fieldwork was completed on May 10, 2022 by GG Environmental (Geoffrey Gray, MA, PWS). The project footprint was traversed on foot. The study area was visually observed from within the parcel boundaries and from publicly-accessible roads, complimented by a review of historic aerial imagery. Representative photos are presented in **Appendix C**.

3.4. Wetland Delineation Guidance, Regulatory Jurisdiction

The wetland investigation was performed in reference to routine methods described in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0)* (Corps 2008). Plants were identified by scientific name and wetland indicator status per Corps (2020).

Since the project occurs within unincorporated Kittitas County and is located outside shoreline jurisdiction, jurisdictional wetlands and streams are regulated under CAO Chapter 17A – *Critical Areas* (Kittitas County 2022a).

3.5. Geospatial Documentation

Features were geospatially surveyed with a Motorola G7 Power mobile phone, running the Mapit Spatial GIS application paired via Bluetooth® with a Juniper Systems Geode™ Multi-Global Navigation Satellite System (Multi-GNSS) receiver capable of sub-meter horizontal accuracy.

4. Existing Conditions

4.1. Topography

The west boundary of the project footprint begins at the toe of an escarpment of glacial outwash materials (DNR 2022c). However, topography within the project footprint is relatively flat, slightly undulating, and generally sloped at approximately one percent toward the east. Decades of management for hay production has eliminated any finer topographic variation, resulting in smooth slopes that are plowed, graded, and cultivated to uniformly direct flood irrigation waters across the hayfields. Highest elevations are to the north and south, and opposing slope aspects meet in a slight east-west swale within which an excavated tailwater ditch drains excess irrigation water toward the east.

4.2. Geology

The Thorp Prairie, extending southeast to Thorp, lies upon aggraded till materials deposited by glaciers (“Pleistocene alpine glacial drift”) (DNR 2022c). The west boundary of the project footprint occurs at the eastern escarpment toe of these raised glacial till materials. The project footprint lies upon a lower terrace of alluvial sediment comprised of clay, silt, sand, gravel and/or cobble deposits (“Quaternary alluvium”).

4.3. Soils

4.3.1. Soils mapped upon glacial drift

West of the project footprint, the two dominant soil map units east of I-90 include Reeser-Reelow-Sketter complex, 2 to 5 percent slopes and Reeser ashy clay loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes (NRCS 2022a) (**Appendix A-2**). These map units are similar in their geomorphic association, composition, profile, permeability, and shallow depth to restrictive feature (duripan).

Reeser-Reelow-Sketter complex, 2 to 5 percent slopes: **Reeser** is associated with fan remnants. Comprised of alluvium and glacial drift with an influence of loess and volcanic ash, the typical profile includes ashy clay loam and clay to 22 in with cemented material and cemented extremely gravelly sandy loam below 22 in. It is well drained, with depth to the water table at more than 80 in, but it exhibits a depth to duripan of 20 to 40 in. It does not flood or pond and is not listed as a hydric soil. **Reelow** is associated with fan remnants and terraces. Comprised of alluvium and glacial drift with an influence of loess and volcanic ash, the typical profile includes ashy clay loam and gravelly clay to 14 in with cemented material and cemented extremely gravelly sandy loam below 14 in. It is well drained, with depth to the water table at more than 80 in, but it exhibits a depth to duripan of 10 to 20 in. It does not flood or pond and is not listed as a hydric soil. **Sketter** is associated with terraces and fan remnants. Comprised of alluvium and glacial drift over a duripan with an influence of loess mixed with volcanic ash at the surface, the typical profile includes cobbly ashy loam, gravelly ashy loam, and extremely cobbly sandy clay to 21 in with cemented material and cemented extremely gravelly sandy loam below 21 in. It is well drained, with depth to the water table at more than 80 in, but it exhibits a depth to duripan of 20 to 40 in. It does not flood or pond and is not listed as a hydric soil.

Reeser ashy clay loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, is associated with fan remnants. Comprised of alluvium and glacial drift with an influence of loess and volcanic ash, the typical profile includes ashy clay loam and clay to 22 in with cemented material and cemented extremely gravelly sandy loam below 22 in. It is well drained, with depth to the water table at more than 80 in, but it exhibits a depth to duripan of 20 to 40 in. It does not flood or pond and is not listed as a hydric soil. Minor components include **Sketter** (5 percent) and **Reelow**, (5 percent), neither of which is listed as a hydric soil.

4.3.2. Soils mapped within the project footprint

Two soil units underlie the project footprint. **Metser clay loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes,** is associated with alluvial fans and terraces. Comprised of alluvium with an influence of volcanic ash in the upper part, the typical profile includes clay loam and clay to 30 in with very gravelly sandy clay and extremely gravelly sandy clay below 30 in. It is moderately well-drained and exhibits a depth to water table of about 30 to 37 in. It does not flood or pond and is not listed as a hydric soil. Minor components include **Vanderbilt** (10 percent) and **Ackna**, (5 percent), neither of which is listed as a hydric soil.


Vanderbilt ashy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes is associated with alluvial fans. Comprised of alluvium with an influence of volcanic ash in the surface, the typical profile includes ashy loam to 28 in and clay loam below 28 in. It is well-drained and exhibits a depth to water table of greater than 80 in. It does

not flood or pond and is not listed as a hydric soil. Minor components include **Mitta** (5 percent), **Nosel** (5 percent), and **Umtanum**, (5 percent), none of which is listed as a hydric soil.

4.4. Irrigation Regime

According to historic aerial imagery, the study area and surrounding landscape has been irrigated since at least 1954 (CWU 2022, Google 2022) (**Figure 4**) although this practice likely began decades earlier.

Figure 4. Irrigation Regime



Water arrives via the unlined West Side Canal from which water is diverted across the landscape via a complex network of excavated irrigation ditches, lateral dikes, weirs, culverts, and pipes. This infrastructure is maintained and managed to collectively distribute water, via gravity flow, onto otherwise dry land.

In lower areas where flood irrigation surface flow can temporarily impound, irrigation tailwater ditches are cut to direct water downslope, thereby maximizing farmable acreage.

Regional irrigation practices can artificially raise the groundwater table. Groundwater in the project footprint is not only influenced by immediate flood irrigation practices, but likely by upgradient irrigation as well. The sources of upgradient hydrology west of Thorp Depot Rd include seepage from the unlined West Side Canal, multiple irrigated crop circles, and a maze of unlined irrigation

ditches, dikes and swales. Given the shallow depth to impervious duripan in these areas, combined with an average topographic slope toward the east, a significant amount of irrigation water likely flows, both surface and subsurface, down-gradient toward the project footprint.

4.5. Plants

Vegetation on irrigated land includes cultivated hay and pasture forage species. Irrigation ditch banks and bottoms are commonly dominated by non-native reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinaceae*) (FACW³) with small patches of cattails (*Typha latifolia*) (OBL⁴). Non-native and noxious weeds are also present, including poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) (Kittitas County Class A Noxious Weed). Irrigation ditches excavated at the escarpment toe support a woody overstory colonized by a variety of native shrubs and trees, including both upland species and species associated with wetlands including black elder (*Sambucus nigra*) (FACU⁵), choke cherry (*Prunus virginiana*) (FAC⁶), Nootka rose (*Rosa nutkana*) (FACU), red osier (*Cornus alba*) (FACW), narrow-leaf willow (*Salix exigua*) (FACW), quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) (FACU), and cottonwood (*Populus balsamifera*) (FAC).

4.6. Precipitation and Hydrology

Chapter 19 of the Engineering Field Handbook (NRCS 2015) was referenced in determining if precipitation that fell within three months of the site visit was within the normal range (30-year average). Normal climatic conditions prevailed the aggregate three months prior to the May 10 field visit (**Appendix B**). However, due to the geomorphic character of the vicinity, pervious soils, and local irrigation practices, the relative contribution of precipitation toward soil moisture in the study area during the growing season is low.

4.7. Growing Season

According to Climate Analysis for Wetlands Tables (WETS) (NRCS 2022b), the growing season (28 °F or greater) at the nearest AgACIS station (Ellensburg) demonstrates a 70 percent probability of occurring between April 16 and October 14 (181 days) and 50 percent between April 20 and October 10 (173 days). Fieldwork was completed during the growing season.

4.8. Mapped Wetlands

The NWI and county both map wetlands within the study area including Palustrine Forested/Scrub-shrub, Riverine, and Palustrine Emergent wetlands (**Appendix A-1**).

4.9. Mapped Streams

Kittitas County maps an unnamed Type 2 (F) (fish-bearing) stream within the study area and along the south shoulder of Goodwin Road (**Appendix A-4**).

³ FACW (Facultative Wetland Plants) – usually occur in wetlands, but may occur in non-wetlands.

⁴ OBL (Obligate Wetland Plants) – almost always occur in wetlands.

⁵ FACU (Facultative Upland Plants) – usually occur in non-wetlands, but may occur in wetlands.

⁶ FAC (Facultative Wetland Plants) – occur in wetlands and non-wetlands.

4.10. 100-year Floodplain and Channel Migration Zone

Kittitas County maps the FEMA⁷ floodplain and channel migration zone (CMZ) of the Yakima River in the northeast corner of the study area (**Appendix A-6**).

5. Findings and Discussion

5.1. Wetlands

Irrigation ditches were flowing, thereby exhibiting wetland hydrology, albeit, artificial. Hydrophytic wetland vegetation is rooted in some irrigation ditch reaches, but its spatial location is closely correlated to, and dependent upon, the moisture ditches provide during the growing season via seepage and, perhaps, elevated groundwater, during the growing season. The confluence of irrigation ditch flow and flood irrigation water results in significant hydrologic buildup where opposing slope aspects meet, but a representative soil sample evaluated in a patch of cattails just downgradient of observed surface water in the ditches failed to show hydrology and soil indicators. This observation can be explained in that the presence of cattails (and other wetland-associated plants) is common where water is consistently irrigated on uplands/permeable soils during the growing season. The development of hydric soil indicators can be inhibited where soils are well-drained and water moves quickly through the soil profile. The lack of hydrology at the sample location demonstrates that water infiltrates quickly into the upper 12-16 in of the soil profile. Therefore, given the pervious character of soils, irrigation as a primary hydrology source during the growing season, and correlation between wetland vegetation and ditch location, it is concluded that the sole reason wetland vegetation is present within the study area is probably due to ongoing irrigation practices.

Although irrigation ditches can delineate as *biological* wetlands, the county does not regulate those *artificial wetlands intentionally created from non-wetland sites, including, but not limited to, irrigation and drainage ditches, grass-lined swales, canals, detention facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, farm ponds, and landscape amenities* per CAO Sections 17A.02.840 and 17A.07.020(1). Given the best available science in the context of the CAO, it is determined that no jurisdictional wetlands are present within the study area.

5.2. Streams

The county maps an unnamed Type 2 (F) (fish-bearing) stream parallel to the south shoulder of Goodwin Road (Kittitas County 2022b) for which it assigns a regulatory buffer of 100 feet (ft)⁸ per CAO Section 17A.04.030 – *Riparian Management Zones and Buffers* plus a 15-ft building setback per CAO 17A.01.090(4) – *Building Setbacks* (**Appendix A-4**). The stream is not designated as critical

⁷ Federal Emergency Management Agency

⁸ For the Columbia Plateau Ecoregion



habitat for Mid-Columbia River Distinct Population Segment steelhead (NOAA 2022) or bull trout (USFWS 2022b). Although StreamNet (WDFW 2022a) does not identify it as supporting fish, it is presumed by WDFW that fish can access the creek (WDFW 2022b).

No other streams are mapped within the study area in the 1902 USGS topographic map (**Appendix A-5**), 1958 USGS topographic map (**Figure 2**), or by the NHD (**Appendix A-5**).

5.3. Floodplain and Channel Migration Zone

The county maps the FEMA 100-year floodplain, FEMA 500-year floodplain, and CMZ of the Yakima River as intersecting parcel 443233. The FEMA 500-year floodplain overlaps the boundary of parcel 493233 (**Appendix A-6**).

6. Limitations

The data presented herein reflect site conditions encountered on May 10, 2022. Work was performed in accordance with accepted standards for professional wetland biologists and applicable and current federal, state, and local ordinances. Although this report is accurate and complete to the best of available scientific knowledge, it should be considered a preliminary determination, with no warranty, express or implied, until it has been reviewed, and approved in writing, by appropriate jurisdictional authorities.

7. Consultant Qualifications

Geoffrey Gray is a professional biologist and wetland scientist whose 25-year career has provided him with a unique breadth of experience that can readily assist you in moving your project forward.

Investing eight years in higher education, he earned a Bachelor's Degree in Business Management and a Master's degree in Biology from California State University at Fresno.

Geoffrey has earned 12.4 credit hours of certified professional wetland training, including completion of the 38-hour *Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Wetland Delineation and Management Training Program*, as well as *Corps Advanced Wetland Delineation*, *Corps Delineation Manual Regional Supplements*, *Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) 2014 Wetland Rating System*, *Ecology Credit-Debit Method for Estimating Mitigation Needs*, *Ecology Selecting Wetland Mitigation Sites Using a Watershed Approach*, and multiple courses in wetland plant identification.

Continuously employed as a wetland, fish, and wildlife biologist since 1997, while serving tenures in field research, a large environmental consulting firm, state agencies in both California and Washington, and as an independent environmental consultant, Geoff's resume includes over 16 years of full-time duty as a wetland biologist, with experience ranging from the unique vernal pool wetland habitats of California's Central Valley to the diverse wetlands of Eastern Washington State, stretching from the Cascade crest to Idaho. Spanning his career, Geoff has performed over 90 wetland delineations and has managed 40 wetland mitigation/riparian restoration sites. As a fish and wildlife biologist, he has evaluated over 620 projects for compliance under the Endangered Species Act, including over 120 federal consultations.

Geoff founded GG Environmental in 2015, and has since served a diverse palette of clients including habitat restoration groups, private landowners, commercial businesses, developers, and local governments who need assistance in overcoming the challenges of Critical Areas/Shorelines permitting and Endangered Species Act consultation.

A professional-level GPS/GIS user for over 20 years, Geoff employs cutting-edge GPS technology in the field and is proficient in GIS mapping with ArcGIS and QGIS.

Certified as a Professional Wetland Scientist by the Society of Wetland Scientists, Geoff's work is performed to the highest standards and is fully insured.

8. References

- [Corps]. 2008. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0), Wakeley JS, Lichvar RW, Noble CV, editors. Vicksburg (MS): US Army Engineer Research and Development Center. ERDC/EL TR-08-28. Available at: https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Regulatory-Program-and-Permits/reg_supp/
- [Corps]. 2020. National Wetland Plant List, version 3.5. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development Center, Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, Hanover, NH. Available at: <http://wetland-plants.usace.army.mil/>
- [CWU]. Central Washington University [CWU]. 2022. Department of Geology. Central Washington Historical Aerial Photograph Project [Internet]. Available at: https://www.gis.cwu.edu/geog/historical_airphotos/
- [DNR] 2022a. Washington Wetlands and Plants of High Conservation Value Map Viewer. Available at: <https://wadnr.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5cf9e5b22f584ad7a4e2aebc63c47bda>
- [DNR] 2022b. Washington LIDAR Portal. Division of Geology and Earth Resources. Available at: <https://lidarportal.dnr.wa.gov/#47.33743:-121.32236:12>
- [DNR] 2022c. Washington Geologic Information Portal. Available at: https://geologyportal.dnr.wa.gov/2d-view#wigm?-13909936,-13029381,5817998,6230146?Surface_Geology,500k_Surface_Geology,Map_Units
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Vicksburg (MS): US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. Technical Report Y-87-1. Available at: <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Portals/50/docs/regulatory/wlman87.pdf>
- Google. 2022. Google Earth Pro - Historic Aerial Imagery [Software Program]. Download available at: <https://www.google.com/earth/versions/>
- Kittitas County. 2022a. Kittitas County Code, Title 17A Critical Areas. Available at: <https://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/boc/countycode/title17a.aspx>
- Kittitas County. 2022b. COMPAS. Mapped critical areas including FEMA floodplain, CMZ, wetlands and streams. Available at: <https://kitcogis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8bcc146d9c2847acb2e9aa239187c25e>
- [NOAA]. 2022. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. ESA Designated Critical Habitat Mapper. Available at: <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=75e5f6b4387f4809b5a6b1f251e38bda#>
- [NRCS] Natural Resource Conservation Service. 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resources Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. United States Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. Issued 2006. Available at: https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_050898.pdf

- [NRCS] 2015. Hydrology Tools for Wetland Identification and Analysis. Chapter 19 in Part 650 Engineering Field Handbook. Pages 19-85 through 19-89. US. Department of Agriculture, NRCS. Available at:
<https://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/OpenNonWebContent.aspx?content=37808.wba>
- [NRCS] 2022a. Web Soil Survey [Internet]. Available at:
<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>
- [NRCS] 2022b. Field Office Technical Guide. Agricultural Applied Climate Information System (AgACIS). Climate Data for Kittitas County, Station Ellensburg, including WETS tables. Available at: <http://agacis.rcc-acis.org/?fips=53037>
- [USFWS] US Fish and Wildlife Service. 2022a. National Wetland Inventory (NWI) mapper [Internet]. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html>
- [USFWS] 2022b. Critical Habitat Mapper [Internet]. Available at:
https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?url=https://services.arcgis.com/QVENGdaPbd4LUkLV/ArcGIS/rest/services/USFWS_Critical_Habitat/FeatureServer/0&source=sd
- [USGS] 2022a. United States Geological Survey. National Geospatial Program. National Hydrography Dataset. Available at: <https://ecology.wa.gov/Research-Data/Data-resources/Geographic-Information-Systems-GIS/Data#s>
- [USGS] 2022b. United States Geological Survey. topoView. Historic topographic maps. Available at: <https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/topoview/>
- [WDFW] 2022a. StreamNet. Available at:
<https://psmfc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3be91b0a32a9488a901c3885bbfc2bob>
- [WDFW] 2022b. E-mail exchange with Jennifer Nelson (WDFW) regarding fish presence in the mapped Type 2 (F) stream. Email date: 5-16-2022 (8:29AM).

Appendix A. Background Information

Appendix A includes the following sub-appendices:


- A-1 USFWS NWI and Kittitas County Wetlands
- A-2 NRCS Soil Survey Map
- A-3 1954 Historic Aerial Image
- A-4 Kittitas County Stream Map and Regulatory Buffer
- A-5 USGS 1902 Topographic Map and NHD
- A-6 FEMA Floodplain and CMZ




This page is purposefully blank.




Appendix A-1. USFWS NWI and Kittitas County Wetlands






Appendix A-2. NRCS Soil Survey Map



Map Unit Legend

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
|------------------------------------|--|--------------|----------------|
| 558 | Argixerolls-Durixerolls complex, 30 to 70 percent north slopes | 27.1 | 5.7% |
| 563 | Mendian very fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 14.1 | 3.0% |
| 584 | Varodale clay, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 2.1 | 0.5% |
| 587 | Argixerolls, 15 to 30 percent slopes | 5.5 | 1.2% |
| 589 | Nack-Brickmill complex, 0 to 5 percent slopes | 3.8 | 0.8% |
| 592 | Umtanum ashy silt loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 10.9 | 2.3% |
| 602 | Brickmill gravelly ashy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 5.6 | 1.2% |
| 603 | Reeser ashy clay loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 35.2 | 7.4% |
| 609 | Ackna ashy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 1.8 | 0.4% |
| 612 | Nitcha ashy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 39.3 | 8.3% |
| 720 | Nanum ashy sandy clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 7.9 | 1.7% |
| 791 | Mitta ashy silt loam, drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 2.8 | 0.6% |
| 794 | Kayak-Weirman complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 0.1 | 0.0% |
| 800 | Brysill gravelly ashy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 6.7 | 1.4% |
| 809 | Weirman-Kayak-Zillah complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 68.9 | 14.6% |
| 820 | Modsel complex, 0 to 5 percent slopes | 9.8 | 2.1% |
| 822 | Reeser-Reelow-Sketter complex, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 58.9 | 12.5% |
| 839 | Vanderbilt ashy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 45.0 | 9.5% |
| 841 | Metser clay loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes | 125.9 | 26.7% |
| 957 | Kayak-Weirman complex, rarely flooded, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 1.0 | 0.2% |
| Totals for Area of Interest | | 472.4 | 100.0% |


Appendix A-3. 1954 Historic Aerial Image




This page is purposefully blank.




Appendix A-4. Kittitas County Stream Map and Regulatory Buffer






Appendix A-5. USGS 1902 Topographic Map and NHD



National Hydrography Dataset

May 12, 2022




- National Hydrography Dataset**
- NHD Watercourses
 - Stream/river (perennial)
 - Stream (intermittent)
 - NHD Waterbodies
 - Lake/pond/reservoir
 - Swamp/marsh
 - Canal/ditch
 - Ice mass
 - NHD Areas
 - Large river
 - Rapids
 - Foreshore
 - Canal/ditch


Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and

Miles 0 0.125 0.25 0.5



Appendix A-6. FEMA Floodplain and CMZ





This page is purposefully blank.

Appendix B. Precipitation Analysis

Precipitation analysis per NRCS (2015). All data were obtained from the AgACIS weather station⁹ at Ellensburg. Fieldwork was completed on May 10, 2022.

Normal climatic conditions prevailed the previous three months prior to fieldwork (March to April). Shortly before fieldwork, 0.69 inches of rain fell within the prior 10 days.

| | Month | Long-term rainfall records ¹ (inches) | | | Total Rainfall Obs. ² | Condition dry, wet, normal ³ | Condition Value | Month weight value ⁴ | Product of previous two columns |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|---------|---------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | 3 yrs. in 10 less than | Average | 3 yrs. in 10 more than | | | | | |
| 1 st prior month | Apr | 0.35 | 0.59 | 0.71 | 1.07 | Wet | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| 2 nd prior month | Mar | 0.36 | 0.76 | 0.93 | 0.44 | Normal | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 3 rd prior month | Feb | 0.59 | 0.91 | 1.10 | T | Dry | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Sum | | | | | | | | 14⁵ | |

¹ WETS table (NRCS 2022b); ² Accumulated Daily Precipitation (NRCS 2022b); ³ WETS table “30% more than and 30% less than values are referenced to compare recorded rainfall to statistically-normal precipitation; ⁴ Value: Dry = 1; Normal = 2; Wet = 3; ⁵ 6-9: drier than normal, 10-14: normal, 15-18: wetter than normal.


| Date (2022) | Precipitation Total (inches) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| May 10 (fieldwork) | 0 |
| April 30 – May 9 (prior 10 days) | 0.69 |

⁹ (NRCS 2022b). AgACIS station: Ellensburg, Kittitas County (FIPS 53037).

This page is purposefully blank.



Appendix C. Photos



This page is purposefully blank.



Photo 1
Irrigation ditch. View toward W.



Photo 2
Excavated pond. Groundwater at ~7 ft.
View toward SW.



Photo 3
Test pit. No groundwater to 3 ft.



Photo 4
Irrigation weir and pipes.
View toward E.



Photo 5
Irrigation ditch.
View toward W.



Photo 6
Type 2 (F) stream along Goodwin Rd.
View toward W.



Photo 7
Gated concrete irrigation ditch.
View toward S.



Photo 8
Gated concrete irrigation ditch to gated pipe.
View toward S.



Photo 9
Irrigation tailwater ditch convergence.
View toward NW.



Photo 10
Cattails near irrigation tailwater ditch.
View toward W.



Photo 11
Test pit with groundwater at 3 ft.
View toward NE.



Photo 12
Woody vegetation along irrigation ditch. View
toward NW.



Photo 13
Irrigation tailwater ditch.
View toward E.



Photo 14
Irrigation ditch supporting woody vegetation.
View toward SE.

