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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 10-Jul-2014
B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Tulsa District, SWT-2014-00303-JD4
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State :	OK - Oklahoma
County/parish/borough:	Tulsa
City:	Broken Arrow
Lat:	35.9844
Long:	-95.8262
Universal Transverse Mercator	Folder UTM List *UTM list determined by folder location* • NAD83 / UTM zone 15N Waters UTM List *UTM list determined by waters location* • NAD83 / UTM zone 15N
Name of nearest waterbody:	Arkansas River
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW):	Arkansas River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC):	11110101

☐ 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: 26-Jun-2014
☑ Field Determination Date(s): ☐

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
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:
Area: 3.44 (m²)
Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:
based on: Established by OHWM.
OHWM Elevation: 647 (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:

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: 3808 acres
Drainage area: 246 acres
Average annual rainfall: 41 inches
Average annual snowfall: 9.7 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 30 (or more) river miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1-2 river miles from RPW.
Project Waters are 25-30 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1-2 aerial(straight) miles from RPW.
☐ Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.
Explain:
Waters of this pond do not serve as any boundaries and do not cross into other states.
Identify flow route to TNW:[5]
The water captured by this impoundment flows southward into an intermittent stream where is flows into the Arkansas River.

Tributary Stream Order, if known:

Order	Tributary Name
1	SWT-2014-303_South Pond

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:
Tributary is:

Tributary Name	Natural	Artificial	Explain	Manipulated	Explain
SWT-2014-303_South					This second pond is just south of the first pond to the north. There is a culvert and more concrete rubble just to the south of this pond that acts like a drainage. The rubble is there for apparent erosion

Pond	-	-	-	X	control.

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

Tributary Name	Width (ft)	Depth (ft)	Side Slopes
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	-	1	3:1

Primary tributary substrate composition:

Tributary Name	Silt	Sands	Concrete	Cobble	Gravel	Muck	Bedrock	Vegetation	Other
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Tributary Name	Condition\Stability	Run\Riffle\Pool Complexes	Geometry	Gradient (%)
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	The banks on this pond seem reletively stable as well. This pond has an adjacent wetland to the west that appears to flow into this pond, apparent through vegetation change and more erosion control structures (concre rubble).	There are no riffles or runs present. This impoundment catches water from the upstream flow events and the northern pond.	Relatively straight	-

(c) Flow:

Tributary Name	Provides for	Events Per Year	Flow Regime	Duration & Volume
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	Ephemeral flow	11-20	This second pond catches water from the ephemeral drainage and the pond just to the north of it. It flows to the south towards the Arkansas River from this second impoundment.	-

Surface Flow is:

Tributary Name	Surface Flow	Characteristics
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	Discrete and confined	Water from this impoundment is captured from the upstream ephemeral drainage and pond. The water then exits to the south via small drainage where it enters the intermittent stream waters near the southern boundary of the project boundary.

Subsurface Flow:

Tributary Name	Subsurface Flow	Explain Findings	Dye (or other) Test
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	Unknown	N/A	-

Tributary has:

Tributary Name	Bed & Banks	OHWM	Discontinuous OHWM[7]	Explain
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	X	X	-	-

Tributaries with OHWM[6] - (as indicated above)

Tributary Name	OHWM	Clear	Litter	Changes in Soil	Destruction Vegetation	Shelving	Wrack Line	Matted\Absent Vegetation	Sediment Sorting	Leaf Litter	Scour	Sediment Deposition	Flow Events	Water Staining	Changes Plant	Other
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	X	-

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:

Tributary Name	MHWM	Survey to Datum	Physical Markings	Vegetation Lines Change in Type
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	X	-	-	X

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

Tributary Name	Explain	Identify specific pollutants, if known
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	This southern impoundment captures the upstream flow events where it exits the southern end of the pond through a culvert. The water in this pond appears to have high levels of turbidity.	No known specific pollutants.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:

Tributary Name	Riparian Corridor	Characteristics	Wetland Fringe	Characteristics	Habitat
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	X	Riparian corridor just to the south of this pond appears to be approximately 300 ft wide.	-	-	-

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.

Findings for: SWT-2014-303_South Pond
This stream channel and impoundment function to absorb water from storm events and slow the delivery of runoff water to downstream waters. In addition, the ephemeral drainage and norhtern impoundment trap sediments, nutrients, and pollutants and reduce their transport to downstream TNWs. Some of the nutrients are utilized in primary production in the riparian corridor and some contaminants are taken up in the vegetation. Nitrogen uptake and conversion in a watershed is greatest in small streams where there is a large benthic surface available for biological activity relative to the small volume of water in the stream. The potential for nitrogen uptake and conversion decreases downstream as the volume of water grows larger relative to the available benthic surfaces. This nutrient uptake and conversion in the small stream functions to reduce the levels of nutrients and contaminants in downstream RPWs and TNWs. Without this impoundment on an ephemeral drainage, runoff from storm events would drain off of the landscape quicker and be delivered downstream sooner producing higher peak and shorter duration storm flows, which is a contributing factor to flooding at points downstream.

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:

Tributary Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m^2)
SWT-2014-303_South Pond	Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs	-	13921.18464
Total:		**0**	**13921.18464**

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]
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 soley 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	Delineation of Potential Section 404 Issues	This is a wetland delineation field report conducted by Enercon Services, Inc. Prepared by Rebecca Carroll and reviewed by David X. Willams, Ph.D.
--Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	Delineation of Potential Section 404 Issues	This is a wetland delineation field report conducted by Enercon Services, Inc. Prepared by Rebecca Carroll and reviewed by David X. Willams, Ph.D
--Photographs	Google Earth Pro	Google Earth Pro tools and aerial photos were utilized during this JD.

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.