

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 02-May-2012

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: New York District, NAN-2009-01134-JD1

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State : NY - New York
County/parish/borough: Jefferson
City: Diana
Lat: 44.13
Long: -75.455
Universal Transverse Mercator
 Folder UTM List
UTM list determined by folder location
 • NAD83 / UTM zone 18N
 Waters UTM List
UTM list determined by waters location
 • NAD83 / UTM zone 18N

Name of nearest waterbody: Indian Pond
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW): Indian River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 4150303

- 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 the action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:

- Office Determination Date:
 Field Determination Date(s): 10-Sep-2009

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

There "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.

- 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 "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area.

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:¹

Water Name	Water Type(s) Present
Wetland B, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands
Wetland Z, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

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

Area: (m²)
Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:

based on:
OHWM Elevation: (if known)

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands:³

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain:

Wetland B is an emergent wetland located within the existing trail and was created from uplands by rutting and compacting the existing soils as a result from skidding operations. This wetland sits between 796 and 798 feet above mean sea level and is 0.02 acres in size. Wetland B is 68 feet from the nearest jurisdictional wetland and 1283 aerial feet from the nearest stream, the outlet of Indian Pond, a perennial Relatively Permanent Water (RPW). This wetland does not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Wetland B is a depressional wetland isolated from other water bodies and does not provide any ecologic/hydrologic interconnection to downstream waters. Wetland B has been created from uplands as a result from the logging operations that has eroded and compacted the existing soils. Shallow bedrock is underneath creating an aquitard. This wetland is also of a different vegetative covertype of the closest jurisdictional wetland area (forested wetland) and is approximately 4 feet higher in elevation. The contributing hydrology for this wetland is likely surface water runoff and precipitation.

Wetland Z is an emergent wetland located within the existing trail and was created from uplands by rutting and compacting the existing soils as a result from skidding operations. This wetland sits between 790 and 792 feet above mean sea level and is 0.04 acres in size. Wetland Z is 68 feet from the nearest jurisdictional wetland and 1130 aerial feet from the nearest water body, Indian Lake, a Traditional Navigable Water (TNW). This wetland does not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Wetland Z is a depressional wetland isolated from other water bodies and does not provide any ecologic/hydrologic interconnection to downstream waters. Wetland Z has been created from uplands as a result from the logging operations that have eroded and compacted the existing soils with shallow bedrock creating an aquitard. This wetland is also of a different vegetative covertype of the closest jurisdictional wetland area (forested wetland) and is approximately 2-4 feet higher in elevation. The contributing hydrology for this wetland is likely surface water runoff and precipitation.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

1. TNW

Not Applicable.

2. Wetland Adjacent to TNW

Not Applicable.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size:

Drainage area:

Average annual rainfall: inches

Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through [] tributaries before entering TNW.

:Number of tributaries

Project waters are river miles from TNW.

Project waters are river miles from RPW.

Project Waters are aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are aerial(straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.

Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW:⁵

Tributary Stream Order, if known:

Not Applicable.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:

Tributary is:

Not Applicable.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Not Applicable.

Primary tributary substrate composition:

Not Applicable.

Tributary (conditions, stability, presence, geometry, gradient):

Not Applicable.

(c) Flow:

Not Applicable.

Surface Flow is:

Not Applicable.

Subsurface Flow:

Not Applicable.

Tributary has:

Not Applicable.

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction:

High Tide Line indicated by:

Not Applicable.

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:

Not Applicable.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:**Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).**

Not Applicable.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:

Not Applicable.

2. Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW**(i) Physical Characteristics:****(a) General Wetland Characteristics:****Properties:**

Not Applicable.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:**Flow is:**

Not Applicable.

Surface flow is:

Not Applicable.

Subsurface flow:

Not Applicable.

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Not Applicable.

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:

Not Applicable.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:**Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).**

Not Applicable.

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports:

Not Applicable.

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any):**All wetlands being considered in the cumulative analysis:**

Not Applicable.

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

Not Applicable.

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW.

Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Significant Nexus: **Not Applicable****D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE:****1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands:**

Not Applicable.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:⁸

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters:⁹

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:¹⁰

Waters Name	Interstate/Foreign Travelers	Fish/Shellfish Commerce	Industrial Commerce	Interstate Isolated	Explain	Other Factors	Explain
Wetland B, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wetland Z, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Water Name	Adjacent To TNW Rationale	TNW Rationale
Wetland B, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-
Wetland Z, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Water Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Wetland B, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	80.93712
Wetland Z, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	202.3428
Total:		0	283.27992

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):
- Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (Explain):
- Other (Explain):

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

Water Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Wetland B, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	80.93712
Wetland Z, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	202.3428
Total:		0	283.27992

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Not Applicable.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD

(listed items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference below):

Data Reviewed	Source Label	Source Description
--Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	Indian Pond Trail impacts drawing	Drawing entitled "Indian Pond Trail - Restoration Project", Prepared by the GIS component of Public Works-Environmental Division Fort Drum, New York, dated 2 February 2012 and last revised 6 March 2012
--Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	-	-
----Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report	Application Report	Report entitled "Joint Application for Permit: Indian Pond Access Trail", prepared by Fort Drum Environmental Division, dated February 2012

--Other information

Site Inspection Report

SIR dated 30 AUG 2011, describing observations at site inspection on 10 SEPT 2009

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Not Applicable.

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.

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

⁵-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.

⁶-A 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.

⁷-Ibid.

⁸-See Footnote #3.

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.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 02-May-2012

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: New York District, NAN-2009-01134-JD2

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State : NY - New York
County/parish/borough: Jefferson
City: Diana
Lat: 44.13
Long: -75.455
Universal Transverse Mercator
 Folder UTM List
UTM list determined by folder location

- NAD83 / UTM zone 18N

 Waters UTM List
UTM list determined by waters location

- NAD83 / UTM zone 18N

Name of nearest waterbody: Indian Pond
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW): Indian River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 4150303

- 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 the action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:

- Office Determination Date:
 Field Determination Date(s): 10-Sep-2009

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

There "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.

- 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 "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area.

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:¹

Water Name	Water Type(s) Present
Wetland X, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands
Wetland Y, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

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

Area: (m²)
Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:

based on:
OHWM Elevation: (if known)

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands:³

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain:

Wetland X is an emergent wetland located within the existing trail and was created from uplands by rutting and compacting the existing soils as a result from skidding operations. This wetland sits between 802 and 804 feet above mean sea level and is 0.02 acres in size within the project area and 0.06 acres overall. Wetland X is 272 feet from the nearest jurisdictional wetland and 840 aerial feet from the nearest water body, Indian Pond, a perennial RPW. This wetland does not meet the Significant Nexus standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Wetland X is a depressional wetland isolated from other water bodies and does not provide any ecologic/hydrologic interconnection to downstream waters. Wetland X has been created from uplands as a result from the logging operations that have eroded and compacted the existing soils with shallow bedrock creating an aquitard. This wetland is also of a different vegetative covertype of the closest jurisdictional wetland area (forested wetland) and is approximately 14 feet higher in elevation. The contributing hydrology for this wetland is likely surface water runoff and precipitation.

Wetland Y is an emergent wetland located within the existing trail and was created from uplands by rutting and compacting the existing soils as a result from skidding operations. This wetland sits at 808 feet above mean sea level and is 0.01 acres in size. Wetland Y is 220 feet from the nearest jurisdictional wetland and 1200 aerial feet from the nearest water body, Indian Pond, a perennial RPW. This wetland does not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Wetland Y is a depressional wetland isolated from other water bodies and does not provide any ecologic/hydrologic interconnection to downstream waters. Wetland Y has been created from uplands as a result from the logging operations that have eroded and compacted the existing soils with shallow bedrock underneath creating an aquitard. This wetland is also of a different vegetative covertype of the closest jurisdictional wetland area (forested wetland) and is approximately 20 feet higher in elevation. The contributing hydrology for this wetland is likely surface water runoff and precipitation.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

1. TNW

Not Applicable.

2. Wetland Adjacent to TNW

Not Applicable.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size:

Drainage area:

Average annual rainfall: inches

Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through [] tributaries before entering TNW.

:Number of tributaries

Project waters are river miles from TNW.

Project waters are river miles from RPW.

Project Waters are aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are aerial(straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.

Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW:⁵

Tributary Stream Order, if known:

Not Applicable.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:

Tributary is:

Not Applicable.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Not Applicable.

Primary tributary substrate composition:

Not Applicable.

Tributary (conditions, stability, presence, geometry, gradient):

Not Applicable.

(c) Flow:

Not Applicable.

Surface Flow is:

Not Applicable.

Subsurface Flow:

Not Applicable.

Tributary has:

Not Applicable.

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction:

High Tide Line indicated by:

Not Applicable.

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:

Not Applicable.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Not Applicable.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:

Not Applicable.

2. Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW**(i) Physical Characteristics:****(a) General Wetland Characteristics:****Properties:**

Not Applicable.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:**Flow is:**

Not Applicable.

Surface flow is:

Not Applicable.

Subsurface flow:

Not Applicable.

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Not Applicable.

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:

Not Applicable.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Not Applicable.

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports:

Not Applicable.

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any):**All wetlands being considered in the cumulative analysis:**

Not Applicable.

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

Not Applicable.

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW.

Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Significant Nexus: **Not Applicable**

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE:

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands:

Not Applicable.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:⁸

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters:⁹
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:¹⁰

Waters Name	Interstate/Foreign Travelers	Fish/Shellfish Commerce	Industrial Commerce	Interstate Isolated	Explain	Other Factors	Explain
Wetland X, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wetland Y, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Water Name	Adjacent To TNW Rationale	TNW Rationale
Wetland X, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-
Wetland Y, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Water Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Wetland X, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	40.46856
Wetland Y, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	40.46856
Total:		0	80.93712

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):
- Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (Explain):
- Other (Explain):

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

Water Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Wetland X, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	40.46856
Wetland Y, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands	-	40.46856
Total:		0	80.93712

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction.
Not Applicable.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD

(listed items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference below):

Data Reviewed	Source Label	Source Description
--Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	Indian Pond Trail impacts drawing	Drawing entitled "Indian Pond Trail - Restoration Project", Prepared by the GIS component of Public Works-Environmental Division Fort Drum, New York, dated 2 February 2012 and last revised 6 March 2012
--Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	-	-
---Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report	Application Report	Report entitled "Joint Application for Permit: Indian Pond Access Trail", prepared by Fort Drum Environmental Division, dated February 2012
--Other information	Site Inspection Report	SIR dated 30 AUG 2011, describing observations at site inspection on 10 SEPT 2009

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Not Applicable.

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.

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

⁵-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.

⁶-A 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.

⁷-Ibid.

⁸-See Footnote #3.

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.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 02-May-2012

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: New York District, NAN-2009-01134-JD3

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State : NY - New York
 County/parish/borough: Jefferson
 City: Diana
 Lat: 44.13
 Long: -75.455
 Universal Transverse Mercator: Folder UTM List
UTM list determined by folder location
 • NAD83 / UTM zone 18N
 Waters UTM List
UTM list determined by waters location
 • NAD83 / UTM zone 18N
 Name of nearest waterbody: Indian Pond
 Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW): Indian River
 Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 4150303

- 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 the action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:

- Office Determination Date:
 Field Determination Date(s): 10-Sep-2009

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

There "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.

- 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 "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area.

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:¹

Water Name	Water Type(s) Present
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

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

Area: (m²)
Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:

based on:
OHWM Elevation: (if known)

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands:³

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain:

Wetland X is an emergent wetland located within the existing trail and was created from uplands by rutting and compacting the existing soils as a result from skidding operations. This wetland sits between 802 and 804 feet above mean sea level and is 0.02 acres in size within the project area and 0.06 acres overall. Wetland X is 272 feet from the nearest jurisdictional wetland and 840 aerial feet from the nearest water body, Indian Pond, a perennial RPW. This wetland does not meet the Significant Nexus standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Wetland X is a depressional wetland isolated from other water bodies and does not provide any ecologic/hydrologic interconnection to downstream waters. Wetland X has been created from uplands as a result from the logging operations that have eroded and compacted the existing soils with shallow bedrock creating an aquitard. This wetland is also of a different vegetative covertype of the closest jurisdictional wetland area (forested wetland) and is approximately 14 feet higher in elevation. The contributing hydrology for this wetland is likely surface water runoff and precipitation.

Wetland Y is an emergent wetland located within the existing trail and was created from uplands by rutting and compacting the existing soils as a result from skidding operations. This wetland sits at 808 feet above mean sea level and is 0.01 acres in size. Wetland Y is 220 feet from the nearest jurisdictional wetland and 1200 aerial feet from the nearest water body, Indian Pond, a perennial RPW. This wetland does not meet the Significant Nexus standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Wetland Y is a depressional wetland isolated from other water bodies and does not provide any ecologic/hydrologic interconnection to downstream waters. Wetland Y has been created from uplands as a result from the logging operations that have eroded and compacted the existing soils with shallow bedrock underneath creating an aquitard. This wetland is also of a different vegetative covertype of the closest jurisdictional wetland area (forested wetland) and is approximately 20 feet higher in elevation. The contributing hydrology for this wetland is likely surface water runoff and precipitation.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

1. TNW
 Not Applicable.

2. Wetland Adjacent to TNW

Not Applicable.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size:

Drainage area:

Average annual rainfall: inches

Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through [] tributaries before entering TNW.

:Number of tributaries

Project waters are river miles from TNW.

Project waters are river miles from RPW.

Project Waters are aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are aerial(straight) miles from RPW.

- Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.

Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW.⁵

Tributary Stream Order, if known:

Not Applicable.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:

Tributary is:

Not Applicable.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Not Applicable.

Primary tributary substrate composition:

Not Applicable.

Tributary (conditions, stability, presence, geometry, gradient):

Not Applicable.

(c) Flow:

Not Applicable.

Surface Flow is:

Not Applicable.

Subsurface Flow:

Not Applicable.

Tributary has:

Not Applicable.

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction:

High Tide Line indicated by:

Not Applicable.

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:

Not Applicable.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality;general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Not Applicable.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:

Not Applicable.

2. Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland Name	Size (Acres)	Wetland Type	Wetland Quality	Cross or Serve as State Boundaries. Explain
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	.17	PEM, LEM, LAB	undisturbed wetland fringe along pond	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	.02	PEM	disturbed, within existing trail corridor	-

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is:

Wetland Name	Flow	Explain
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Intermittent flow.	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Intermittent flow.	-

Surface flow is:

Wetland Name	Flow	Characteristics
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Discrete and confined	Indian Pond fringe wetland is part of large PFO/PSS wetland, which abuts Indian Pond and an unnamed tributary to Indian Lake. Indian Lake is part of Indian River, which is a TNW.
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Overland sheetflow	Wetland A is part of large PFO/PSS wetland, which abuts Indian Pond and an unnamed tributary to Indian Lake. Indian Lake is part of Indian River, which is a TNW.

Subsurface flow:

Wetland Name	Subsurface Flow	Explain Findings	Dye (or other) Test
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Wetland Name	Directly Abutting	Discrete Wetland Hydrologic Connection	Ecological Connection	Separated by Berm/Barrier
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Yes	-	-	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Yes	-	-	-

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:

Wetland Name	River Miles From TNW	Aerial Miles From TNW	Flow Direction	Within Floodplain
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Wetland Name	Explain	Identify specific pollutants, if known
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports:

Wetland Name	Riparian Buffer	Characteristics	Vegetation	Explain
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-

Habitat for:

Wetland Name	Habitat	Federally Listed Species	Explain Findings	Spawn Area	Explain Findings	Other Environmentally Sensitive Species	Explain Findings	Aquatic/Wildlife Diversity	Explain Findings
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	X	-	-	X	lacustrine fringe wetland	-	-	-	-
Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any):

All wetlands being considered in the cumulative analysis:

Not Applicable.

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

Not Applicable.

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW. Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Significant Nexus: **Not Applicable**

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE:

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands:

Not Applicable.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:⁸

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Wetland Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Indian pond fringe wetland, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs	-	687.96552

Wetland A, 2009-01134, USA Ft Drum	Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs	-	80.93712
Total:		0	768.90264

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters:⁹

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:¹⁰

Not Applicable.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

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):
- Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (Explain):
- Other (Explain):

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

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction.

Not Applicable.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.**A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD**

(listed items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference below):

Data Reviewed	Source Label	Source Description
--Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	Indian Pond Access Road, Wetland Delineation	Delineation drawing prepared by the GIS Component of Public Works, Environmental Division, Fort Drum, dated 12 January 2012
--Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	-	-
----Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report	Joint Application for Permit: Indian Pond Access Trail	Report prepared by the Environmental Division, Fort Drum Public Works, dated February 2012
--Photographs	-	-
----Other	on-site photographs	Photos taken at 10 Sept 2009 site inspection

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Not Applicable.

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.

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

⁵ -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.

⁶ -A 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.

⁷ -ibid.

⁸ -See Footnote #3.

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.