Print Form | Save As | E-mail

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

INTERIM DRAFT RAPID ORDINARY HIGH WATER MARK (OHWM) FIELD IDENTIFICATION DATA SHEET

The proponent agency is Headquarters USACE CECW-CO-R.

Form Approved -
OMB No. 0710-0025
Expires: 01-31-2025

AGENCY DISCLOSURE NOTICE

The public reporting burden for this collection of information, 0710-OHWM, is estimated to average 30 **minutes** per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or burden reduction suggestions to the Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, at whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

Project ID #: Dexter Elementry School | Site Name: Zuckerman Ave Site | Date and Time: 11/15/2023 1300-1600

Location (lat/long): 32.356331°,-84.950589° | Investigator(s): Robin Armetta, Alex Metz, Jonathan Brown

Step 1 Site overview from remote and online resources
Check boxes for online resources used to evaluate site:

- [ ] gage data
- [x] LiDAR
- [ ] geologic maps
- [x] climatic data
- [x] satellite imagery
- [ ] land use maps
- [x] aerial photos
- [x] topographic maps
- [ ] Other: _____

Describe land use and flow conditions from online resources.
Were there any recent extreme events (floods or drought)?
Current land use of area surrounding the intermittent stream/storm water drainage ditch is open field with a playground and dog park present. Area was recently indicated to be identified as incipient drought in the Antecedent Precipitation tool but was stated to be within normal precipitation conditions for the area. A light steady rained occurred during the day of the site visit. Looking at the USGS stream stats website, it is likely that this intermittent stream/storm water drainage ditch drains into the Chattahoochee River.

Step 2 Site conditions during field assessment. First look for changes in channel shape, depositional and erosional features, and changes in vegetation and sediment type, size, density, and distribution. Make note of natural or man-made disturbances that would affect flow and channel form, such as bridges, riprap, landslides, rockfalls etc.

The storm water drainage ditch/intermittent stream was straight in shape with a few slight curves throughout. The feature is about 210 feet long with the widest vegetative point approximately 80 feet wide while the majority of the of it is about 50 feet wide. The storm water drainage ditch/ intermittent stream starts of with bedrock to sandy soil with rocks downstream. Sediment throughout the feature was predominately sand, dark yellowish brown in color (10YR 4/4) with some pockets of clay material, reddish in color (2.5YR 5/8) with very little muck present. The majority of the stream/drainage ditch was dry with few pockets of water where the sediments were predominately clay. Culverts were present on both ends of the feature for water drainage.

Step 3 Check the boxes next to the indicators used to identify the location of the OHWM.
OHWM is at a transition point, therefore some indicators that are used to determine location may be just below and above the OHWM. From the drop-down menu next to each indicator, select the appropriate location of the indicator by selecting either just below `b', at `x', or just above `a' the OHWM.
Go to page 2 to describe overall rationale for location of OHWM, write any additional observations, and to attach a photo log.

Geomorphic indicators

- [x] **Break in slope:** x
  - [x] *on the bank:* x
  - [x] *undercut bank:* x
  - [ ] *valley bottom:*
  - [ ] Other: _____
- [ ] **Shelving:**
  - [ ] *shelf at top of bank:*
  - [ ] *natural levee:*
  - [ ] *man-made berms or levees:*
  - [ ] *other berms:* _____
- [x] **Channel bar:**
  - [ ] *shelving (berms) on bar:*
  - [x] *unvegetated:* b
  - [x] *vegetation transition (go to veg. indicators)* x
  - [ ] *sediment transition (go to sed. indicators)*
  - [ ] *upper limit of deposition on bar:*
- [ ] **Instream bedforms and other bedload transport evidence:**
  - [ ] *deposition bedload indicators (e.g., imbricated clasts, gravel sheets, etc.)*
  - [ ] *bedforms (e.g., pools, riffles, steps, etc.):*
  - [ ] *erosional bedload indicators (e.g., obstacle marks, scour, smoothing, etc.)*
- [ ] **Secondary channels:**

Sediment indicators

- [ ] **Soil development:**
- [x] **Changes in character of soil:** x
- [ ] **Mudcracks:**
- [x] **Changes in particle-sized distribution:** b
  - [x] *transition from* Sand to Clay
  - [ ] *upper limit of sand-sized particles*
  - [ ] *silt deposits:*

Vegetation Indicators

- [x] **Change in vegetation type and/or density:** x

  Check the appropriate boxes and select the general vegetation change *(e.g., graminoids to woody shrubs).* ***Describe the vegetation transition looking from the middle of the channel, up the banks, and into the floodplain.***
  - [x] *vegetation absent to:* moss
  - [x] *moss to:* forbs
  - [x] *forbs to:* deciduous trees
  - [ ] *graminoids to:*
  - [ ] *woody shrubs to:*
  - [ ] *deciduous trees to:*
  - [ ] *coniferous trees to:*
- [x] **Vegetation matted down and/or bent:** b
- [x] **Exposed roots below intact soil layer:** b

Ancillary indicators

- [x] **Wracking/presence of organic litter:** x
- [ ] **Presence of large wood:**
- [x] **Leaf litter disturbed or washed away:** x
- [x] **Water staining:** x
- [ ] **Weathered clasts or bedrock:**

Other observed indicators? Describe:

Trash and debris seen along the stream bed. Sediment size transitioned from sand to clay as well as from sand to bedrock depending on location.

Print Form | Save As | E-mail

Project ID #: Dexter Elementry School

Step 4 Is additional information needed to support this determination? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, describe and attach information to datasheet:

Step 5 Describe rationale for location of OHWM

Change in vegetation type from non-vegetated to vegetated was a primary indicator. Deposition of organic litter along wrack line present and presence of water-stained leaves observed. Break in slope at the top of channel aligned with the changes from no vegetation to vegetation (moss then to forbs to deciduous trees). Disturbed/washed away leaf litter was an ancillary indicator.

Additional observations or notes

Attach a photo log of the site. Use the table below, or attach separately.

Photo log attached? ☒ Yes ☐ No If no, explain why not: _____

List photographs and include descriptions in the table below.

Number photographs in the order that they are taken. Attach photographs and include annotations of features.

Photo Number	Photograph description
1	Northwest culvert facing Zuckerman Ave.
2	Sandy Soil Profile within dry portions of channel bed. Munsell color of 10YR 4/4
3	Clay Soil profile in ponded portions of channel bed. Munsell color of 2.5 YR 5/8
4	Image of stream channel with leaf litter debris looking towards Bjronstadt St.
5	Leaf litter buildup
6	Water stained leaves
7	Standing water within channel bed
8	Bar in channel looking towards Bjornstadt St.
9	Break in bank slope/Embankment scarp
10	Undercutting of large tree along channel bank

Print Form | Save As | E-mail

OHWM Field Identification Datasheet Instructions and Field Procedure

Step 1 Site overview from remote and online resources **Complete Step 1 prior to site visit.**

Online Resources: Identify what information is available for the site. Check boxes on datasheet next to the resources used to assess this site.

a. gage data
b. aerial photos
c. satellite imagery
d. LiDAR
e. topographic maps
f. geologic maps
g. land use maps
h. climatic data (precipitation and temperature)

Landscape context: Use the online resources to put the site in the context of the surrounding landscape.

a. **Note on the datasheet under Step 1:**
   i. Overall land use and change if known
   ii. Recent extreme events if known (e.g., flood, drought, landslides, debris flows, wildfires)
b. Consider the following to inform weighting of evidence observed during field visit.
   i. What physical characteristics are likely to be observed in specific environments?
   ii. Was there a recent flood or drought? Are you expecting to see recently formed or obscured indicators?
   iii. How will land use affect specific stream characteristics? How natural is the hydrologic regime? How stable has the landscape been over the last year, decade, century?

Step 2 Site conditions during the field assessment (assemble evidence)

a. Identify the assessment area.
b. Walk up and down the assessment area noting all the potential OHWM indicators.
c. Note broad trends in channel shape, vegetation, and sediment characteristics.
   i. Is this a single thread or multi-thread system? Is this a stream-wetland complex?
   ii. Are there any secondary and/or floodplain channels?
   iii. Are there obvious man-made alterations to the system?
   iv. Are there man-made (e.g., bridges, dams, culverts) or natural structures (e.g., bedrock outcrops, Large Wood jams) that will influence or control flow?
d. Look for signs of recurring fluvial action.
   i. Where does the flow converge on the landscape?
   ii. Are there signs of fluvial action (sediment sorting, bedforms, etc.) at the convergence zone?
e. Look for indicators on both banks. If the opposite bank is not accessible, then look across the channel at the bank.
f. **In Step 2 of the datasheet** describe any adjacent land use or flow conditions that may influence interpretation of each line of evidence.
   i. What land use and flow conditions may be affecting your ability to observe indicators at the site?
   ii. What recent extreme events may have caused changes to the site and affected your ability to observe indicators?

Step 3a List evidence

Assemble evidence by checking the boxes next to each line of evidence:

a. If needed, use a separate scratch datasheet to check boxes next to possible indicators, or check boxes of possible indicators in pencil and use pen for final decision.
b. If using fillable form, then follow the instructions for filling in the fillable form.

Context is important when assembling evidence. For instance, pool development may be an indicator of interest on the bed of a dry stream, but may not be a useful indicator to take note of in a flowing stream. On the other hand, if the pool is found in a secondary channel adjacent to the main channel, it could provide a line of evidence for a minimum elevation of high flows. Therefore, consider the site context when deciding which indicators provide evidence for identifying the OHWM. Explain reasoning in Step 5.

Questions to consider while making observations and listing evidence at a site:

Geomorphic indicators	Sediment and soil indicators	Vegetation Indicators	Ancillary indicators
Where are the breaks in slope?	Where does evidence of soil formation appear?	Where are the significant transitions in vegetation species, density, and age?	Is there organic litter present?
Are there identifiable banks?	Are there mudcracks present?	Is there vegetation growing on the channel bed?	Is there any leaf litter disturbed or washed away?
Is there an easily identifiable top of bank?	Is there evidence of sediment sorting by grain size?	If no, how long does it take for the non-tolerant vegetation to establish relative to how often flows occur in the channel?	Is there large wood deposition?
Are the banks actively eroding?		Where are the significant transitions in vegetation?	Is there evidence of water staining?
Are the banks undercut?		Is the vegetation tolerant of flowing water?	
Are the banks armored?		Has any vegetation been flattened by flowing water?	
Is the channel confined by the surrounding hillslopes?			
Are there natural or man-made berms and levees?			
Are there fluvial terraces?			
Are there channel bars?			

Are the following features of fluvial transport present?

Evidence of erosion: obstacle marks, scour, armoring
Bedforms; riffles, pools, steps, knickpoints/headcuts
Evidence of deposition: imbricated clasts, gravel sheets, etc.

In some cases, it may be helpful to explain why an indicator was NOT at the OHWM elevation, but found above or below. It can also be useful to note if specific indicators (e.g., vegetation) are NOT present. For instance, note if the site has no clear vegetation zonation.

OHWM Field Identification Datasheet Instructions and Field Procedure

Step 3b Weight each line of evidence and weigh body of evidence

Weight each indicator by considering its importance based upon:

a. Relevance:

i. Is this indicator left by low, high, or extreme flows?

Tips on how to assess the indicator relative to type of flow:

Consider the elevation of the indicator relative to the channel bed.
What is the current flow level based on season or nearby gages?
Consider the elevation of the indicator relative to the current flow.
If the stream is currently at baseflow and indicator is adjacent to that, then it is likely a low flow indicator. The difference between high and extreme flow indicators can sometimes be difficult to determine.

***Landscape context from Step 1 can help determine the relevance, strength, and reliability of the indicators observed in the field.**

***Information in Chapter 2 of the OHWM field manual provides information on specific indicators which can assist in putting these in context and determining relevance, strength, and reliability.**

ii. Did recent extreme events and/or land use affect this indicator?

1. Recent floods may have left many extreme flow indicators, or temporarily altered channel form. Other resources will likely be needed to support any OHWM identification at this site. Field evidence of the OHWM may have to wait for the site to recover from the recent flood.
2. Droughts may cause field evidence of OHWM to be obscured, because there has been an extended time since the last high flow event. There can be overgrowth of vegetation or deposition of material from surrounding landscape that can obscure indicators.
3. Both man-made (e.g., dams, construction, mining activities, urbanization, agriculture, grazing) and natural (e.g., fires, floods, debris flows, beaver dams) disturbances can all alter how indicators are expected to appear at a site. Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 of the OHWM field manual provides specific case-studies that can help in interpreting evidence at these sites.

b. Strength:

i. Is this indicator persistent across the landscape?

1. Look up and downstream and across the channel to see if you see the same indicator at multiple locations.
2. Does the indicator occur at the same elevation as other indicators?

c. Reliability:

i. Is this indicator persistent on the landscape over time? Will this indicator still persist across seasons?

1. This can be difficult to determine for some indicators and may be specific to climatic region (in terms of persistence of vegetation) and history of land use or other natural disturbances.
2. Chapter 2, Chapter 6, and Chapter 7 of the OHWM field manual describes each indicator in detail and provides examples of areas where indicators are difficult to interpret.

d. Weigh body of evidence:

i. Combine weights: integrate the weighted line of evidence (relevance, strength, reliability) of each indicator.

ii. For each of the observed indicators, which are more heavily weighted? Where do high value indicators co-occur along the stream reach? Do they co-occur at a similar elevation along the banks relative to water surface (or channel bed if there is no water).

iii. On datasheet, select the indicators used to identify the OHWM. Information in Chapter 2 of the OHWM field manual provides descriptions of specific indicators which can assist in putting these in context and determining relevance, strength, and reliability.

e. Take photographs of indicators and attach a log using either page 2 of datasheet or another method of logging photos.

i. Annotate photos with descriptions of indicators.

Step 4 Is additional information needed? Are other resources needed to support the lines of evidence observed in the field?

a. If additional resources are needed, then repeat steps 3a and 3b for the resources selected in Step 1 of assembling, weighting, and weighing evidence collected from online resources. Chapter 5 of the OHWM field manual provides information on using online resources.

b. Any data collected from online tools have strengths and weaknesses. Make sure these are clear when determining relevance, strength, and reliability of the remotely collected data. Clearly describe why other resources were needed to support the lines of evidence observed in the field, as well as the relevance, strength, and reliability of the supporting data and/or resources.

c. Attach any remote data and data analysis to the datasheet.

Step 5 Describe rationale for location of OHWM:

a. Why do the combination of indicators represent the OHWM?

b. If there are multiple possibilities for the OHWM, explain why there are two (or more) possibilities. Include any relevant discussion on why specific indicators were not included in the final decision.

c. If needed, add additional site notes on page 2 of the datasheet under Step 5.