

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

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): **MAY 08 2014**

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: New York District; Mohr, David; NAN-2013-00413

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: East side of West Ave., north of Washington Ave.

State: NY County/parish/borough: Saratoga City: Saratoga Springs

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 43.08118° N, Long. -73.80303° E.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Unnamed tributary to Putnam Brook

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Hudson-Hoosic, 02020003

☒ 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.

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

☐ Office (Desk) Determination. Date:

☒ Field Determination. Date(s): July 23, 2013

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 acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 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: Refer to Sections III.B.2, III.C and III.F of this form.

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over 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 aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

1. **TNW**

Identify TNW:

Summarize rationale supporting determination:

2. **Wetland adjacent to TNW**

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent":

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

This section summarizes information regarding characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under *Rapanos* have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are "relatively permanent waters" (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant nexus evaluation. Corps districts and EPA regions will include in the record any available information that documents the existence of a significant nexus between a relatively permanent tributary that is not perennial (and its adjacent wetlands if any) and a traditional navigable water, even though a significant nexus finding is not required as a matter of law.

If the waterbody⁴ is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a 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 **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵:

Tributary stream order, if known:

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.

(b) **General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):**

Tributary is: ☐ Natural
☐ Artificial (man-made). Explain:
☐ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

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

Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. **Characteristics:**

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. **Explain findings:**

☐ Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: | |

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

| | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- ☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- ☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics:
- ☐ Habitat for:
 - ☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - ☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - ☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - ☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

(i) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland size: 1.56 acres

Wetland type. Explain: Wetland 2 is a predominantly forested palustrine wetland. Western portion is disturbed and contains phragmites australis.

Wetland quality. Explain: Limited functions as it is hydrologically cut off from other surface waters. The wetland has been disturbed by surrounding development and now encroachment by invasive species.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: Project waters do not cross or serve as state boundaries.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **No Flow**. Explain: Wetland 2 slopes gently to the west, to West Avenue. West Avenue bisects Wetland 2 and the wetlands located on the west side of West Avenue. There are no culverts or other drainage systems that provide a surface hydrological connection between Wetland 2 to the wetlands on the opposite side of West Avenue. The culvert that was once present was filled in by the New York State Department of Transportation over 12 years ago and no longer functions. Although portions of Wetland 2 are frequently inundated, water marks on trees suggest that the water does not reach an elevation where it could overtop West Avenue and flow into the western off-site wetlands and ultimately into the unnamed tributary to Putnam Brook on any routine or predictable basis. Wetland 2 used to be part of State Wetland S-47, which also includes the wetlands on the west side of West Avenue. Once the NYSDEC confirmed that there was a lack of hydrological connection between Wetland 2 and the other wetlands, the NYSDEC decided by letter dated April 30, 2002, that Wetland 2 is no longer considered a state regulated wetland. Wetland 2 is influenced by groundwater, however, given the fill in place for West Avenue and lack of culvert, subsurface flow from Wetland 2 to reach the unnamed tributary (which is 579 feet away) is highly unlikely. The more routinely ponded areas within Wetland 2 are located further to the east from West Avenue and the West Avenue road embankment is intact, with no signs of erosion.

Surface flow is: **Not present**

Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **No**. Explain findings: There is a physical barrier between Wetland 2 and the wetlands on the west side of West Avenue. The nearest tributary is 579 feet to the west of Wetland 2.

☐ 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: Wetland 2 is located on the east side of West Avenue. There are wetlands located on the west side of West Avenue. West Avenue separates these wetlands, and there is no culvert or other type of drainage facility present that would hydrologically connect the two wetlands. The unnamed tributary to Putnam Brook is located off-site, on the western side of West Avenue. The tributary starts 579 feet away from the Wetland 2.

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **5-10** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **2-5** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **No Flow**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **500-year or greater** 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: The standing water within Wetland 2 is clear. Water quality is good.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: There are no known pollutants, but Wetland 2 would likely receive typical pollutants from road runoff. Traffic is heavy on West Avenue, estimated at over 10,000 vehicles per day.

(iii) **Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):**

- ☐ Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):

☒ Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: Predominantly forested, 100% cover, with small portion of western wetland area dominated by *Phragmites australis*.

☒ Habitat for:

☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings:

☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:

☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:

☒ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: Wetlands and edge uplands provide habitat for amphibians, birds and small mammals.

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 1

Approximately (1.56) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

| <u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u> | <u>Size (in acres)</u> | <u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u> | <u>Size (in acres)</u> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| N | 1.56 | | |

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: Wetland 2 is predominantly forested, but the western portion of the wetland has become dominated with *Phragmites australis*. Wetland 2 does not function as a floodplain for the unnamed tributary to Putnam Brook (the RPW into which Wetland 2 had a historic physical connection to). Wetland 2 functions to varying degrees include groundwater recharge/discharge, floodflow alteration, nutrient removal/retention/transformation and wildlife habitat. The floodflow alteration and wildlife habitat functions of Wetland 2 are limited due to the lack of hydrologic connection to other waters and because it is surrounded by development and it is not ecologically diverse.

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.

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the *Rapanos* Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below:

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:
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: On August 27, 2004, this office issued an approved jurisdictional determination under Application Number NAN-2003-00236, for the subject wetland determining that Wetland 2 is a jurisdictional water of the United States under 33 CFR Part 328.3(a)(7). This determination was appealed, but was upheld by USACE's North Atlantic Division on March 10, 2005 (prior to Carabel/Rapanos). Wetland 2 is located on the east side of West Avenue. Wetlands are present on the opposite side of West Avenue. There is no culvert or other drainage system that provides a direct surface hydrological connection between these waters. Any subsurface flow between these waters is speculative and would be minimal. The tributary to which these wetlands are adjacent starts about 579 feet west of Wetland 2. The off-site wetlands on the west side of West Avenue directly abut the unnamed tributary to Putnam Brook, which is an RPW. Wetland 2 and the off-site wetlands that directly abut the unnamed RPW are not similarly situated given Wetland 2's lack of surface hydrological connection to the RPW, and the severed ecological connection between them. The ecological connection is severed by the lack of hydrological connection and the heavily traveled West Avenue. Therefore Wetland 2 should be assessed on its own. Wetland 2 does not have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to the TNW (Kayaderosseras Creek), which is over 5.7 river miles downstream, due to its lack of surface hydrological connection and Wetland 2's location outside of the 500 year floodplain of the TNW and associated tributaries. Wetland 2 has a negligible potential

to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters from reaching the TNW because it can capture runoff and no longer has an outlet to the unnamed tributary. The 1.56 acre Wetland 2 makes up approximately 0.04% of the total amount of wetlands that are estimated to be within the subject watershed leading to the TNW (unnamed tributary to Putnam Brook to Slade Creek to Geyser Brook to Kayaderosseras Creek). The Kayaderosseras Creek supports a native and stocked trout fishery, and habitat for other fish including walleye. There is a lack of published information concerning non-fish species such as amphibians, reptiles and macroinvertebrates that utilize the TNW. The TNW is within a Bird Conservation Area due to the diversity of species usage, including by neotropical and waterfowl migrants. Wetland 2 does not support any fish and is used on a limited basis by common regional birds. Other species do not have a safe connection to the waters on the other side of West Avenue. Given its lack of physical connection to and the distance to the off-site tributary, Wetland 2 does not provide any measurable habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW. This potential is further hampered from local development that bisects any potential corridor that could have existed and because if there were any remnant physical connection to the unnamed tributary, the tributary is piped for a distance of approximately 600 feet, causing a further impediment to aquatic life passage. Wetland 2 does not have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs because it does not have a surface outlet to downstream waters, nor is it in the floodplain of these waters. Wetland 2 does not have any other relationships to the physical, chemical or biological integrity of the TNW, the Kayaderosseras Creek.

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT 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 data and rationale indicating that tributary is 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-RPWs⁸ 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.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

- ☐ 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 jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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).

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):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: _____

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 (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: **Explanation on findings for Wetland 2 is found in Section III.C above.**
☐ 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: _____
☐ Wetlands: _____ acres.

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 (check all that apply):

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*.

- ☒ 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: 1.56 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: Drawing entitled "Wetland Map, Lands of Mohr", prepared by Gilbert VanGuilder Land Surveyor, PLLC, dated April 21, 1997, and last revised September 26, 2013.
 - ☒ 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: NAN listing for Kayaderosseras Creek.
 - ☒ 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: Saratoga Springs Quadrangle, 7.5 Minute Series.
 - ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Saratoga County Soil Survey.
 - ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: on Saratoga Springs Quadrangle.
 - ☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): on Saratoga Springs Quadrangle.
 - ☒ FEMA/FIRM maps: Map #360910C0433 E, Panel 433 of 693, Effective August 16, 1995.
 - ☒ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 - ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): GIS orthos dated September 25, 2013.
or ☒ Other (Name & Date): ground level on and off-site photos from various dates from 2004 to 2013.
 - ☒ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: NAN-2003-00236, August 27, 2004; and NAN-1997-01270, March 31, 1998.
 - ☒ Applicable/supporting case law: Carabel/Rapanos.
 - ☒ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
 - ☒ Other information (please specify): Functional assessment of Wetland 2 prepared by The Chazen Companies and received by USACE on January 21, 2014; NYSDEC wetland findings letter dated April 30, 2002; All remaining records for NAN-2003-00236, including CENAD appeal findings dated March 10, 2005; and Order of Summary Judgment in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska, Case No. 4:09-cv-0029-RRB (Great Northwest, Inc. vs. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers).

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

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

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):

MAY 08 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: New York District; Mohr, David; NAN-2013-00413

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: East side of West Ave., north of Washington Ave.

State: NY

County/parish/borough: Saratoga

City: Saratoga Springs

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 43.08118° N, Long. -73.80303° E.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Unnamed tributary to Putnam Brook

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Hudson-Hoosic, 02020003

☒ 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.

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

☐ Office (Desk) Determination. Date:

☒ Field Determination. Date(s): July 23, 2013

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 acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 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: Refer to Section III.F of this form.

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over 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 aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

1. TNW

Identify TNW:

Summarize rationale supporting determination:

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent":

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

This section summarizes information regarding characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under *Rapanos* have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are "relatively permanent waters" (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant nexus evaluation. Corps districts and EPA regions will include in the record any available information that documents the existence of a significant nexus between a relatively permanent tributary that is not perennial (and its adjacent wetlands if any) and a traditional navigable water, even though a significant nexus finding is not required as a matter of law.

If the waterbody⁴ is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a 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 Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are Pick List river miles from TNW.

Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.

Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵:

Tributary stream order, if known:

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.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):

Tributary is: ☐ Natural
☐ Artificial (man-made). Explain:
☐ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

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

Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings:

☐ Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: | |

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

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

Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- ☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- ☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics:
- ☐ Habitat for:
 - ☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - ☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - ☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - ☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

2. **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: **Pick List**. Explain:

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) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

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:

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **Pick List**

Approximately () 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

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.

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the *Rapanos* Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below:

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:
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. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT 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 data and rationale indicating that tributary is 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-RPWs⁸ 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 jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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).

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):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:

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To 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.

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 (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: .
☒ Other: (explain, if not covered above): **There is one isolated wetland, identified as Wetland 1, within the JD Boundary. The wetland is currently 0.45 acre and is located entirely within the 8.90 acre site boundary. On August 27, 2004, this office issued an approved jurisdictional determination under Application Number NAN-2003-00236, for the subject wetland determining that Wetland 1 is isolated and is not a water of the United States in light of the SWANCC decision made by the U.S. Supreme Court. The size of this wetland has reduced from the prior JD from 0.98 acre to 0.45 acre by filling and the construction of a stormwater management facility associated with a new car wash. This wetland continues to be physically isolated from any waters of the United States as it is surrounded by uplands. No physical changes have occurred on the site that could have caused this wetland to become part of a surface tributary system. As described in the previous JD, Wetland 1 continues to be connected to, and drain exclusively through, the storm sewer system for the City of Saratoga Springs. This system collects surface runoff from various city streets and directs it to Spring Run, a tributary to Kayaderosseras Creek. There is no evidence that a tributary currently or historically existed along the portion of the storm sewer system that drains these wetlands. A storm sewer system consisting mostly of underground pipes and catch basins is generally not considered to meet the definition of a tributary, as outlined at 33 CFR 328.3(a)(5). In addition, Wetland 1 is located over one mile from Spring Run, and Wetland 1 is separated by the wetlands that were delineated in the northern portion of the property by an upland ridge. Wetland 1 also is not located within a mapped 100 year floodplain. Therefore, during times of heavy precipitation, there is very low probability that floodwater would reach an elevation necessary for water to flow from other jurisdictional waters into the subject wetland. Wetland 1 would not be considered a traditional navigable water in that it does not have the necessary water depth to support navigation of any kind, and it does not have any surface hydrologic connection to a waterbody that would. The wetland does not cross any state boundary and does not have a use that would associate it with interstate commerce.**

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: .
☒ Wetlands: 0.45 acres.

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 (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.

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: Drawing entitled "Wetland Map, Lands of Mohr", prepared by Gilbert VanGuilder Land Surveyor, PLLC, dated April 21, 1997, and last revised September 26, 2013.
☒ 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: NAN listing for Kayaderosseras Creek.
☐ 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: Saratoga Springs Quadrangle, 7.5 Minute Series.
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Saratoga County Soil Survey.
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: on Saratoga Springs Quadrangle.
- ☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): on Saratoga Springs Quadrangle.
- ☒ FEMA/FIRM maps: Map #360910C0433 E, Panel 433 of 693, Effective August 16, 1995.
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): GIS orthos dated September 25, 2013.
or ☒ Other (Name & Date): ground level on and off-site photos from various dates from 2004 to 2013.
- ☒ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: NAN-2003-00236, August 27, 2004.
- ☒ Applicable/supporting case law: SWANCC.
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- ☐ Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: None.