

**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):** August 26, 2016

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** SWT-2014-848

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: Oklahoma County/parish/borough: Rogers City: Near Inola  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 36.113211° **N**, Long. -95.547580° **W**.  
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Inola Creek & Verdigris River

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): HUC12 - 110701050304 & 110701050306

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: August 5, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): July 25, 2016

**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** "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):<sup>1</sup>**

TNWs, including territorial seas

Wetlands adjacent to TNWs

Relatively permanent waters<sup>2</sup> (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: 6480 linear feet: 31 width (ft)

Wetlands: None

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

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

**2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):<sup>3</sup>**

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.  
Explain: There were 44 man-made depressional features, 15 man-made ditches, and 1 upland pond/stock tank, delineated within the 208-acre review area that are not jurisdictional under Section 404 of the CWA.

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

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> 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 waterbody<sup>4</sup> 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: 19301& 14030 acres

Drainage area: ~ 282 acres

Average annual rainfall: 45 inches

Average annual snowfall: 8 inches

**ii. Physical Characteristics:**

**(a) Relationship with TNW:**

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through 1 tributary before entering TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A .

Identify flow route to TNW<sup>5</sup>: The man-made channel flows through the review area, to flow into the unnamed tributary of the Verdigris River, which flows into the TNW (Verdigris River).

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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

Tributary stream order, if known: 1.

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

**Tributary is:**  Natural  
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: The review area was anthropogenically modified from agricultural activities to industrial/urban area during the early 1970's.  
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: .

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

Average width: 31 feet  
Average depth: Not measured  
Average side slopes: Varies

**Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):**

Silts  Sands  Concrete  
 Cobbles  Gravel  Muck  
 Bedrock  Vegetation. Type/% cover:  
 Other. Explain: Man-made channel with previously disturbed soils and vegetated.

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Stable and vegetated.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: Pool complexes behind culverts and from a beaver dam blocking low flow through one of the FS-7 culverts.

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1.9 %

**(c) Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

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

Describe flow regime: Man-made channel flow with OHWM and a channel defined by anthropogenic created bed and banks that receives flow from precipitation events and stormwater runoff from the drainage basin, upland man-made ditches. Pooling occurs upstream and downstream of roadway culverts.

Other information on duration and volume: .

Surface flow is: **Confined**. Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings: .

Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):

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

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

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

**iii) Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).  
Explain: Stained tan in color in pools, vegetation lined channel.

<sup>6</sup>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.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: None known.

**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: The man-made channel was observed to contain small minnow or

juvenile fish species, macroinvertebrate, and amphibian species in the pools. A beaver dam was located on the FS-7 delineated portion of the channel.

**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:

The man-made channel identified as FS-7, FS-17, FS-18, and FS-62 is interconnected by culverted road crossings that eventually flows downstream of the review area, to flow into an unnamed tributary of the Verdigris River, evident on satellite imagery dated from 1995 through 2016. This man-made channel is not indicated on the USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic

Quadrangle Map or the USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), but provides seasonally, relatively permanent flow into an unnamed tributary of the Verdigris River, according to the multiple years of historic satellite imagery and onsite flow observation. The channel receives flows from an average of 45 inches of precipitation annually, from upland sheet flow, and from stormwater drainage within and surrounding the review area, creating a surface hydrological connection to a water of the U.S. The Soil Survey, Rogers County, Oklahoma, dated August 1966, depicts the review area property prior to the current development, indicating two unnamed tributaries of Inola Creek that flowed from north to south on the eastern portion of the review area. The original tributary alignments depicted no longer exist and were severed from Inola Creek on the southeastern review area boundary by this man-made channel. Because of the close proximity of the TNW (Verdigris River < 1 mile), the capacity to carry pollutants and flood waters, the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon to downstream foodwebs, and the ability to provide lifecycle support functions for fish and other species that are present in the TNW, this man-made channel has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity on the TNW and is a waters of the United States. The 6,480 linear feet of jurisdictional waters includes the entire relevant reach of this channel and not just the linear footage associated with the delineation identifiers listed above that are within the review area.

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

Tributary waters: **6,480** linear feet, **31** width (ft).

Other non-wetland waters:            acres.

Identify type(s) of waters:            .

**3. Non-RPWs<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>**

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).

<sup>8</sup>See Footnote # 3.

<sup>9</sup> To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

**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):<sup>10</sup>**

- 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:
- Other: (explain, if not covered above):

There were a total of 64 features identified within the review area. There were 18 features identified as potential tributary waters of the U.S. All of these 18 features are not indicated as a tributary on the USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle Maps or the USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD). Of the 18 features identified, 15 features are man-made ditches excavated wholly in and draining only uplands and that do not carry a relatively permanent flow of water and therefore are not jurisdictional under Section 404 of the CWA. There were 45 depressional features with wetland characteristics identified within the review area that are not indicated on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - National Wetland Inventory, and are not situated adjacent to or abutting a tributary on the USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle Maps or the USGS NHD (with the exception of FS-62, which is associated to ponding of FS-18). These depressional features are geographically located entirely in uplands and were created by the grading and excavation activities associated with the development of the industrial site. In addition, these depressional features don't appear to be relic features of former waters of the U.S. and appear to have been created from storm water ponding in relation to the site design to convey storm water. According to the Soil Survey of Rogers County, Oklahoma, dated August 1966, none of the soil types prior to the site disturbance were hydric (initially ChB, TaA, Br, RmB). Currently soils are listed in USDA-NCSS SSURGO as URB (urban land). The 1 upland pond/stock tank identified is not jurisdictional because it is not indicated on the USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle Maps or the NHD as on-channel or as an impoundment of a tributary and was excavating/diked in dry land. The site visit confirmed all the features, with the exception of man-made RPW channel (Section III B - identified as FS-7, FS-17, FS-18, and FS-62), are not within Section 404 of the CWA jurisdiction, as defined in 33 CFR part 328, within the review area.

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):

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

<sup>10</sup> Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

Wetlands:        acres.

**SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.**

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: "Waters of the United States Assessment, Autumn Project, Inola, Rogers County, Oklahoma, dated June 2015; completed by Eagle Environmental Consulting, Incorporated"
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
  - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: USGS 7.5 Minute, Catoosa SE ,Oklahoma
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Rogers County, Oklahoma, dated August 1966 & USDA-NCSS SSURGO.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS NWI mapper.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: Panels: 40145C0135H, 40131C0435H.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): Google Historical Imagery.
  - or  Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): Oklahoma Mesonet (reference for Rogers County precipitation estimates) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Jurisdictional Guidebook.

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** The review area is an approximately 208 acre tract of land located approximately 5 miles south and west of Inola, Oklahoma.

**The following are the delineation identifiers that are not waters of the United States within the review area:**

Depressional Features  
FS-19 through FS-61, FS-63

Upland Pond  
FS-64

Ditches  
FS1 through FS6, FS8 through FS16

**The following delineation identifier is a water of the United States within the review area:**

Relatively Permanent Water  
FS-7, FS-17, FS-18, and FS-62  
(FS-62 is associated with FS-18 ponding)