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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A.	REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD	: 2/16	/23.
----	--	----	--------	------

B.	DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: <u>Seattle District, Weeks, Michael, NWS-2022-544</u> . Name of water being evaluated on this JD form: <u>unnamed ditch</u>
С.	PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: State: Washington County: SnohomishCity: Marysville Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat: 48.133679 N, Long: -122.180363 E Universal Transverse Mercator: 560982.889331, 5331483.107861. Name of nearest waterbody: Hayho Creek Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 17110011, Quilceda Creek, Possession Sound. 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: 2/16/2023. ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):
	CTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
revi	re Pick List "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the lew 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: EXPLOYED LIST. EXPLOYED LIST. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
The	ere 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): 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 acres. Wetlands: acres.
	c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List and Pick List Elevation of established OHWM (if known):
	 Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³

Version 2-8-08 1 of 8

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

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).

Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

Α.	A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs If the aquatic resource is a TNW, complete Section III.A.1 and Section III.D.1. only; if the a adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Sect	
	TNW Identify TNW: Summarize rationale supporting determination:	
	2. Wetland adjacent to TNW Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent":	
В.	B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT	WETLANDS (IF ANY):
	A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abuttin skip to Section III.D.4.	
	A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant r is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus etributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area iden tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both.	determine if the waterbody has a waluation must consider the that combines, for analytical
	If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offs significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.	
	1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW	
	(i) General Area Conditions: Watershed size: Pick List Drainage area: Pick List Average annual rainfall: inches Average annual snowfall: inches	
	 (ii) Physical Characteristics: (a) Relationship with TNW: ☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW. ☑ Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW. Project waters are Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW. Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW. Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW. Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: Identify flow route to TNW ⁵ : flows south through upland road side ditches for just flows into Hayho Creek, a RPW, which flows into the Middle Fork Quilceda Creek Possession Sound (the nearest TNW) at Marysville.	over a mile (the relevant reach), then signst over 6 miles before entering
	Tributary stream order, if known: (b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply): Tributary is:	discussion at end of this document).
	Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):	

⁴ Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid

West.

Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.

Version 2-8-08

2 of 8 2 of 8

Average width: <u>6 - 8</u> feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: Vertical (1:1 or less).
Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply): Silts Sands Concrete Cobbles Gravel Muck Bedrock Vegetation. Type/% cover: dense woody vegetation Other. Explain:
Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: Tributary geometry: Pick List Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %
(c) Flow: Tributary provides for: Intermittent but not seasonal flow Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: 2-5 Describe flow regime: uncertain about number of flow events, due to lack of physical characteristics of scour and flow, it is likely to be a very small number. Other information on duration and volume:
Surface flow is: Discrete and confined. Characteristics:
Subsurface flow: Unknown . Explain findings: Dye (or other) test performed:
Tributary has (check all that apply): Bed and banks OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): clear, natural line impressed on the bank the presence of litter and debris destruction of terrestrial vegetation shelving the presence of wrack line vegetation matted down, bent, or absent sediment sorting leaf litter disturbed or washed away scour sediment deposition multiple observed or predicted flow events water staining abrupt change in plant community other (list): Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: lacked signs of permanent flow such as defined bed and bank, sorting, and
<u>scour</u> .
If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply): High Tide Line indicated by:
 (iii) Chemical Characteristics: Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.). Explain: <u>linear vegetated narrow corridor between two residential properties</u>. Identify specific pollutants, if known: <u>residential household runoff</u>.
(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply): □ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): dense woody vegetation, 10-15 feet wide. □ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: □ Habitat for: □ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: □ Sish/spawn areas. Explain findings: □ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: □ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

Version 2-8-08 3 of 8

⁶A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

⁷Ibid.

Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW (i) Physical Characteristics: (a) General Wetland Characteristics: Properties: Wetland size: ____ _ acres Wetland type. Explain: _ Wetland quality. Explain: Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: . (b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW: Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: See end of JD for information from consultant. Surface flow is: Pick List Characteristics: _____. Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings: _____. Dye (or other) test performed: _____. (c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW: ☐ Directly abutting ☐ Not directly abutting Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: _____. ☐ Ecological connection. Explain: _ ☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: _____. (d) <u>Proximity (Relationship) to TNW</u> Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW. Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW. Flow is from: Pick List. Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** floodplain. (ii) Chemical Characteristics: Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: Identify specific pollutants, if known: (iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply): Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): _____. Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: _____. ☐ Habitat for: Federally Listed species. Explain findings: _____. Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: . . Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: . . Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any) All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List Approximately ($\underline{0}$) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis. For each wetland, specify the following: Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres) Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres)

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: _____.

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

Version 2-8-08 4 of 8

	1.	Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D: The ditch is the headwaters of a conveyance; therefore, flow is low and seasonal. During wet seasons water ponds rather than flows. Therefore because flow is low, there is little capacity to carry any pollutants or export carbon downstream. There is a woody riparian buffer along the relevant reach of the ditch system. However, along the ditch system, the properties are farmlands converted to residential and commercial uses. This riparian habitat would provide minimal aquatic support functions due to the urban environment. This portion of the ditch system is not utilized by fish species. The relevant reach analyzed is in the upmost headwater system of this drainage. The relevant reach is over 6 miles away from a TNW. Any functional aquatic inputs to the TNW would be minimal and insubstantial due to the distance to the TNW. Therefore, there is no significant nexus to a TNW and as such this non-RPW is not a water of the U.S.
	2.	Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:
	3.	Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:
D.		FERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL AT APPLY):
	1.	TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands. Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area: TNWs: linear feet width (ft), or acres. Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.
	2.	 RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows perennial: Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow "seasonally" (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
		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:
	3.	Non-RPWs ⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.
		Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply): Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft). Other non-wetland waters: acres. Identify type(s) of waters:
	4.	Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
		Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
		Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.
	5.	Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisidictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

⁸See Footnote # 3. Version 2-8-08

		Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.
	6.	Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.
		Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.
	7.	Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.9 As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional. Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).
Е.	DE(SUC	PLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, GRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY CH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): 10 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:
		wide 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.		N-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): 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). Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: see significant nexus discussion above. Other: (explain, if not covered above):
	fact judg	wide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR ors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional gment (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: Wetlands: acres.
		wide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such adding is required for jurisdiction (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: Wetlands: acres.
SE	CTIC	ON IV: DATA SOURCES.

Version 2-8-08 6 of 8

⁹ To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
¹⁰ 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.

SUPI	PORTING 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):
\boxtimes	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: The waterbody is on the Section 10 Navigable Waterway List for Seattle District.
	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 Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
	Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):
	or Cother (Name & Date):
	Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
	Applicable/supporting case law:
	Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
\boxtimes	Other information (please specify): Google Earth images of Site Overview to TNW and Relevant Reach.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitat and Species map, and city of Marysville Critical Areas map for the subject property do not identify any onsite wetlands. Based on a review of USGS Historic Topographic Maps dating back to 1911, no historic wetlands were present at the subject property. Soundview Consultants, LLC confirmed the absence of wetlands at the subject property during their site investigation on 9 July 2019.

One artificially constructed ditch (Ditch Z) was identified on the western property boundary of the subject property. The ditch consists of a linear channel with steep vertical banks approximately 6- to 8-feet wide. No flowing water was observed in the ditch during the 19 July 2019 site investigation. Dense woody vegetation was observed within the ditch during the site investigation, and the feature lacked signs of relatively permanent flow such as defined bed and bank, sorting, and scour.

Google Street View was utilized to view Ditch Z at its crossing with 152nd Street Northeast, immediately north of the subject property.

Imagery captured in July 2009, July 2012, July 2019, and September 2021 show similar conditions of dense woody vegetation and a lack of visible surface water. Imagery from January 2022 shows standing surface water. Photographs taken on 19 May 2022, provided by Soundview Consultants LLC, also show standing surface water.

The WDFW SalmonScape map and Washington State Fish Passage map identify Ditch Z as a "canal / ditch" that originates approximately 0.3 of a mile north of the subject property, immediately south of 156th Street Northeast. Ditch Z is depicted as a linear feature that flows along parcel boundaries approximately 0.8 of a mile before discharging to Hayho Creek which is not subject to this AJD. The City of Marysville Critical Areas map identifies Ditch Z as a non-regulated (by the City of Marysville) portion of Hayho Creek, and indicates that the feature is intermittent adjacent to the subject property. Based on a review of USGS Historic Topographic Maps dating back to 1911, Ditch Z was artificially constructed between the years of 1943 and 1956. On the 1956 topographic map, Ditch Z appears as a linear feature in its present footprint. No historic wetlands or waters exists in the immediate vicinity of the feature historically; therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the ditch was constructed in wetlands or waters. Based on a review of historic aerial imagery, the subject property consistent of agricultural lands between 1943 and 1956, at the time that the ditch was constructed. Based on the apparent land use of the subject property at that time, the ditch was likely constructed for the purpose of stormwater conveyance through agricultural fields.

Based on the information above, Ditch Z appears to have been excavated in uplands, drains only uplands, and does not carry relatively permanent flow. Ditch Z is not used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational purposes, has no habitat or resources of special significance which would attract interstate or foreign travelers, lacks bird and wildlife species of special significance which would attract interstate or foreign travelers, supports no fish or shellfish which could be taken or sold in interstate or foreign commerce, and is not used for industrial, agricultural, or silvicultural activities involving interstate or foreign commerce.

Additional flow information from consultant to support determination of 'intermittent' flow (non-RPW) of subject water: No hydrology was observed within the ditch during the September 2016, March 2018, July 2019, and October 2022 site visits. While the September 2016, July 2019, and October 2022 site visits were during the normal dry season according to the USACE Antecedent Precipitation Tool, the March 2018 site visit was during the wet season and exhibited 'normal conditions' (Attachment B). Groundwater well monitoring was conducted on the parcels associated with the downstream reach of the ditch. n 2018. No hydrology (flowing or standing) was observed during the winter 2018 site investigations or weekly monitoring events through the spring of 2018. While hydrology was observed in the ditch during the May 2022 site visit, the USACE Antecedent Precipitation Tool identifies this time period as being 'wetter than normal.'

Version 2-8-08 7 of 8

According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) station at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (Sea-Tac), precipitation levels during the May 2022 site visit were 186 percent of normal for the prior 30 days leading up to the site investigation, with 2.81 inches of precipitation in the two weeks prior. In addition, vegetation was observed within the downstream reaches of the channel during the May 2022 site visit. This may be indictive of reduced surface flow and infrequent channel scour. Overall, due to the lack of hydrology in during the wet season in 2018, it is not anticipated that the ditch has seasonal downstream flow. The ditch likely contains 'flashy' hydrology sourced from surface runoff associated with upstream impervious surfaces.

Per the coordination memo, the AJD was sent to EPA on 16 September 2022 for their concurrence. They requested additional information.

Additional information was provided and on 14 February 2023, EPA concurred with the Corps' findings of no significant nexus:
therefore, the subject water is not a water of the U.S.

Version 2-8-08 8 of 8