

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Isolated.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 6-3-08.

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Seattle District, OPAL Community Land Trust, NWS-2008-77-NO.
Name of water being evaluated on this JD form: Wetland A, C, D, E, F (B no impact proposed, not included in JD review area)

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Washington County: San Juan City: Eastsound

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat: 48.70298 N, Long: -122.90246 W

Universal Transverse Mercator: _____

Name of nearest waterbody: Puget Sound.

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: _____.

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 17110019.

Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.

Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc.) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form. List other JDs: _____

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: _____.

Field Determination. Date(s): 2-15-08.

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are no** "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]

Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.

Explain: _____.

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are no** "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

- TNWs, including territorial seas
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- Relatively permanent waters² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
- Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: _____ linear feet _____ width (ft) and/or 0 acres.

Wetlands: 0 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual, and Pick List

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): _____.

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: **The review area includes five isolated wetlands (A,C,D,E,F) that cumulatively comprise 0.53-acre. The subject property topography is flat, with 0-3 percent slopes. The Soil Survey of San Juan County identifies Indianola loamy sand mapping unit on the majority of the site. The Indianola series consists of moderately, deep, somewhat excessively**

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

drained soil originating as glacial outwash and occurring on slopes of 3 to 15 percent. Indianola is not a NTCHS listed hydric soil. Corps personnel walked the perimeters of each identified wetlands and verified the delineated wetland boundaries. In addition, the Corps specifically followed any potential surface water flow paths off-site. The Corps concluded the subject property wetlands are hydrologically isolated as no surface water at presumably any time of the year flows off-site to other waters of the U.S. Of particular interest was an excavated ditch (identified on attached map) that had standing water in it at the time of site inspection. Although no flow was present, topography indicated water would flow to the west, off-site. At the property line the ditch feature is no longer present and appears water is simply diverted to the neighboring property to infiltrate. The neighboring property is dominated by Douglas-fir trees and upland shrubs and groundcover. No off-site drainage features are present. The south end of the ditch is in close proximity to a roadside ditch on the north side of Mt. Baker Road. The roadside ditch slopes west, and then rises in elevation approximately 100-feet west of the property (See attached USGS map). If water were to ever back-fill from the property ditch to the roadside ditch, surface water would infiltrate 100-feet west of the site since topography prevents a continuous surface water flow. No water was in the ditch at the time of site review and the consultant verified water was absent during his March 2007 site inspection. The wetlands are on private property which limits the opportunity for public access. These wetlands are not used for interstate commerce including recreational activities, commercial fishing activities, or used for industrial purposes.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

- A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs: NOT APPLICABLE
- B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS: NOT APPLICABLE
- C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION: NOT APPLICABLE
- D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE: NOT APPLICABLE
- E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):⁴

- which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
- from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
- which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
- Interstate isolated waters. Explain: _____.
- Other factors. Explain: _____.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: _____

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: _____ linear feet _____ width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: _____ acres.
Identify type(s) of waters: _____.
- Wetlands: _____ acres.

F. **NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS:**

- If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements.
- Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.
 - Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR).
- Other: (explain, if not covered above): _____.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all that apply):

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): _____ linear feet _____ width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: _____ acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: _____ acres. List type of aquatic resource: _____.

⁴ Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

Wetlands: _____ acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below):

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: _____.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: _____.
- Corps navigable waters' study: _____.
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____.
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: _____
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: _____.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: _____.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): _____
- FEMA/FIRM maps: _____.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: _____ (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): _____
or Other (Name & Date): _____.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: _____.
- Applicable/supporting case law: _____.
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: _____.
- Other information (please specify): _____.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: A JD was not performed for Wetland B since no impacts are proposed for this wetland. Only the wetland B boundary was confirmed.