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): January 18, 2022

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: SWT-2016-539

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State: Oklahoma County/parish/borough: Oklahoma County City: Oklahoma City
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 35.65543° **N**, Long. -97.58168° **W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator:
Name of nearest waterbody: Bluff Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Arkansas River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 110500020801
☒ 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: January 5, 2022
☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

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 waters[2] (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: **Established by OHWM.**
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): N/A.

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: **Wetlands (W-1, 0.17 AC) and (W-2, 0.003 AC) are emergent wetlands which are part of an erosional feature (EF-1, 691 LF) within the review area. The erosional feature and two non-jurisdictional wetlands are indirectly connected to an unnamed tributary (EF-2) via sheet flow through several road culverts and ditches. There is also an isolated emergent wetland (W-3) and an upland pond (P-1) in the review area. The unnamed tributary is located outside of the review area, but is included in the relevant reach for the significant nexus determination**.

[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 waterbody[4] 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: 26,18**acres**
Drainage area: 125 **acres**
Average annual rainfall: 36.21 inches
Average annual snowfall: 7 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:
(a) Relationship with TNW:
☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
☒ Tributary flows through **5** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **30 (or more)** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **1 (or less)** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **30 (or more)** 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[5]: The unnamed tributary (EF-2) flows into an unnamed tributary to Bluff Creek, then into Bluff Creek, then Deer Creek, then Cottonwood Creek, then the Cimmaron River, then the Arkansas River (TNW).

[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.

Tributary stream order, if known: First Order Stream .

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

Tributary is: ☐ Natural
☐ Artificial (man-made). Explain: .
☒ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: Portions of this unnamed tributary have been altered by ditching, creation of an on-channel pond, and culvert crossings under roads.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
Average width: 6 feet
Average depth: 3 feet
Average side slopes: **3:1 .**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

☒ Silts	☐ Sands	☐ Concrete
☐ Cobbles	☐ Gravel	☒ Muck
☐ Bedrock	☒ Vegetation. Type/% cover: The unnamed tributary appears to be covered by approximately 80% herbaceous upland vegetation.	
☐ Other. Explain: .		

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Aerial imagery appears to have a few areas of bank erosion.
Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: none present.
Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 3 %

(c) Flow:
Tributary provides for: **Ephemeral flow**
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20 (or greater)**
Describe flow regime: Flows are limited to response to rain events directly over the drainage area.
Other information on duration and volume: N/A.

Surface flow is: **Confined.** Characteristics: The stream is contained within a confined channel or constructed ditches.

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings: no subsurface flow is expected.
☐ Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):
☒ Bed and banks
☒ OHWM[6] (check all indicators that apply):

☐ clear, natural line impressed on the bank	☐ the presence of litter and debris
☐ 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.[7] Explain: .

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: The Bluff Creek watershed contains numerous 1st order tributaries like the one being evaluated in this review, the upper half of the watershed is composed mostly of streams with narrow or absent riparian buffers surrouned by mixed

[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.

developments. The lower half of Bluff creek where the unnamed tributary being evaluated is located, is composed mostly of undeveloped, agricultural/pasture land. This unnamed tributary is similar to the rest of the lower half of Bluff Creek watershed, with some influence from expanding developments in its drainage area. This unnamed tributary has been modified due to road crossings and an agricultural pond being constructed on channel. This stream appears to lack in stream diversity and primarly conveys storm water. This unnamed tributary is entirely located outside of the review area, but is part of the relevant reach for the Significant Nexus determination.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Typical pollutants from roads and upland residential/commercial development are carried by storm water into and through this area.

(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: (W-1, 0.17 AC) and (W-2, 0.003 AC) acres

Wetland type. Explain: Both adjacent wetlands are palustrine emerent wetlands formed within upgradient headwater of this drainage area.

Wetland quality. Explain: The two wetlands are recently formed and composed of 3 identified species of hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation, this would be representative of average habitat type for the vicinity. The two wetlands formed in the upper-most portion of the drainage area and were previously an ephemeral channel, but due to alterations, the channel was flattened and widened, thus the wetlands formed. These wetlands support very limited habitat and life-cycle functions for aquatic species within the review area.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: No.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Ephemeral flow**. Explain: The wetlands are near the top of the drainage area and are only influenced by direct rain fall at this site.

Surface flow is**: Overland sheetflow**

Characteristics: The wetlands receive flow from a non-jurisdictional erosional feature from direct rain events, thus the out-going flow would be similar.

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings: N/A.

- ☐ Dye (or other) test performed: .

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

- ☐ Directly abutting
- ☒ Not directly abutting
  - ☒ Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: The two wetlands do not directly connect to the unnamed tributary, but due to alterations, down stream flow would be in the form of sheet flow into the unnamed tributary via road culverts. The culverted road crossing recieves flow from road side ditches as well as these adjacent wetlands.
  - ☐ Ecological connection. Explain: .
  - ☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **30 (or more)** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **30 (or more)** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Wetland to navigable waters.**

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: No water observed, however, the wetlands are recently formed and consist of emergent herbaceous plants typically found in abundance in this watershed.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Although no specific pollutants are known, runoff from an adjacent residential development could transport typical pollutants into these wetlands.

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

- ☐ Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- ☒ Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: The largest wetland (W-1) on site was dominated by Symphyotrichum divaricatum, but only represented 10% cover within the sample plot, based on the submitted data forms.
- ☐ 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: **2**

Approximately (0.173) 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)
W-1 (No)	0.17		
W-2 (No)	0.003		

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The relevent reach for this NRPW includes two adjacent wetlands. These wetlands support very limited habitat and life-cycle functions for aquatic species within the review area. These wetlands provide limited water quality benefits associated with pollutant filtering, however, this is speculative. These wetlands have a very limited potential to influence the physical, biological, and chemical processes downstream of these features.

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: The relevant reach for this evaluation extends beyond the review area to include the unnamed tributary (EF-2, 1,800 LF) until it reaches another first order stream, which is just downstream of an on-channel pond. The relevant reach also includes wetlands W-1 and W-2 due to their adjacency to the unnamed tributary. The unnamed tributary (EF-2) recieves sheetflow from the limited drainage area (35 AC) via the two wetlands. The two wetlands are contained in the review area near the top of the drainage area and are only influenced by direct rain fall via the erosional feature (EF-1). The unnamed tributary and the wetlands support very limited habitat and life-cycle functions for aquatic species within the review area, and less for downstream waters. The two wetlands are recently formed and composed of 3 identified species of hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation, this would be representative of average habitat type for the vicinity. The two wetlands formed in the upper-most portion of the drainage area and were previously an ephemeral channel, but due to alterations, the channel was flattened and widened, thus the wetlands formed. Downstream flow would be in the form of sheet flow into the receiving unnamed tributary through a culvert. Although no specific pollutants are known, runoff from the residential development could transport typical pollutants into these wetlands. These wetlands are on a hillside and water would pass through these relatively quickly, limiting the ability for these wetlands to filter out any possible pollutants. These aquatic resources provide limited benefits to the nearest RPW (unnamed tributary to Bluff Creek) however, these limited functions/benefits do not equate to more than speculative or insubstantial benefit to the Arkansas River (TNW), which is more than 200 river miles from these waters. This unnamed tributary and wetlands do not meet the SigNex standard set within the Rapanos Guidance document and is supported within the agent's delineation report as well as this form.

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-RPWs[8] that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - ☐ Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):
   - ☐ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
   - ☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
     Identify type(s) of waters: .

4. **Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - ☐ Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
     - ☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .
     - ☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

   Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

5. **Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - ☐ Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisidictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   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.

[8]See Footnote # 3.

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:**Wetlands (W-1, 0.17 AC) and (W-2, 0.003 AC) are emergent wetlands which are adjacent to the unnamed tributary (EF-2, 1,800 LF) associated with the relevant reach. These wetlands and the unnamed tributary combined do not have more than a speculative benefit to the associated TNW which they would contribute flow indirectly. The TNW in question is over 200 river miles from these waters.**
☒ Other: (explain, if not covered above): **An erosional feature (EF-1, 691 LF) and upland pond (P-1, 0.07 AC) constructed from previous oil well activities is in the review area constructed wholly in the uplands near the top of the drainage 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: (W-3, 0.065 AC) 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: (W-1, 0.17 AC)(W-2, 0.003 AC) 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):

[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.***

- ☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: jd report, data sheets, associated maps.
- ☒ 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: Bluff Creek 110500020801.
  - ☒ USGS NHD data.
  - ☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: 1:24,000 Bethany NE, OK.
- ☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: .
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Bethany NE, OK.
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- ☒ FEMA/FIRM maps: Panel 40083C0500F (9-29-2010).
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: N/A (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth, September 2020.
  or ☒ Other (Name & Date): JD Report photos Dated August 31, 2016.
- ☒ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:SWT-2016-539, dated January 6, 2017.
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- ☐ Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The review area is approximately 40 acres and the relevant reach is approximately 48 acers.