

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): December 18, 2019

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: St. Louis District, YTB International, Inc., MVS-2007-777-002-SWANCC_Smith Lake Tributary

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: Madison County City: near Wood River (unincorporated Madison County)

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 38:51:19.30° **N**, Long. -90:03:33.89° **W**.

Universal Transverse Mercator: 16 North

Name of nearest waterbody: Smith Lake

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: None. The watercourse has been identified as terminating at a locally known lake, Smith Lake, and does not maintaining a connection to a TNW

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Cahokia-Joachim (7140101)

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: December 12, 2019

Field Determination. Date(s): November 28, 2007 (YTB International Property) and December 17, 2007 (ConocoPhillips Property)

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):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: 1.2 acres in total.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³

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.

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

Two site visits were conducted in association with this determination. The first site visit was conducted on the property of the Section 404 applicant – YTB International, Inc., and the second site visit was conducted on property owned by ConocoPhillips.

Reviewed the documentation of the YTB International, Inc. property (YTB Property) on November 28, 2007. Conditions at the site are unchanged. Observations of the site still reveal a linear wetland that met the wetland requirements as established in the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual (i.e., hydric soils, hydrophytic vegetation, and wetland hydrology). Although it displayed wetland features, it was considered as, overall, part of a tributary system. This wetland was mapped as a blue line on the USGS topographic map. Throughout the remainder of the text, the entire blueline will be referred to as “blueline system”. The blueline system originates within the Mississippi River bluffs (see USGS attached); it reaches the river’s historic floodplain, and then flows through the YTB Property. Within the YTB Property, the blueline system contains characteristics of a linear, emergent wetland, as opposed to a stream channel with an OHW. The wetland was determined to not have a direct surface connection to the Mississippi River as the entire blueline system terminates at an off-site lake, locally known as Smith Lake. Smith Lake is located within property owned by ConocoPhillips. The wetland, as well as the upstream headwaters, and terminating Smith Lake have been considered as isolated. Greater detail of the tributary system, Smith Lake, and justification for an isolated determination is outlined in the following paragraphs.

As previously indicated, the wetland within the YTB Property is located within an area mapped as a single blue line. The blueline system originates almost directly north of the property within the Mississippi River bluffs. It flows southward to the property. The natural route of the blueline system has become manipulated over the years, as evidenced in the channelized pattern recognized on the USGS. In 2006, the Illinois Department of Transportation finished the construction of State Route 255, which also crosses the waterway. In conjunction with the highway construction, the upstream headwaters for this blueline system are now routed through a retention pond that was constructed for the purposes of stormwater management. (State Route 255 is not mapped on the USGS map, but can be identified on the supplied aerial) It is anticipated that stream channel conditions are no longer present due to upstream dewatering from the retention pond and siltation through on-site farming practices. From the YTB Property, the blueline system continues to flow south of Highway 143 and into property owned and maintained as a refinery by ConocoPhillips. According to the USGS topographic maps, aerial photographs, FEMA floodplain maps, observations from a site visit of the ConocoPhillips property, and reports provided by two consulting engineers for ConocoPhillips, the watercourse terminates within Smith Lake.

A review of the conditions of Smith Lake previously reviewed by two U.S. Army Corps of Engineers representatives on December 17, 2007. We were accompanied by Mr. Jay Rankin, a representative of the ConocoPhillips Environmental Conservation group. Smith Lake measures approximately 11.5 acres in surface area, and is situated within a natural topographic low within the landscape. From our site visit, it was determined that Smith Lake is comprised of two ponds that are linked together via culvert pipes. The two ponds that form Smith Lake appear as the two southernmost ponds on the USGS map. (The northern pond denoted on the USGS is documented as a solid waste disposal site as part of the U.S. EPA’s RCRA program. There is no open water at this location.) A road bisects the two southern ponds. During the time of the December 2007 site visit, the pond south of the road consisted of open-water conditions, whereas the pond immediately north of the road consisted of wetland conditions. Mr. Rankin explained that in times of wet weather, the south pond will fill up and back water into the north pond. Generally, flooding can occur, but its progression is upstream. During the time of the site visit, the southern pond had approximately 10 feet of freeboard between the surface of the water and the top of the pond’s embankment, displaying a capacity to retain additional water.

We circled Smith Lake to identify any direct surface connection to other waters of the United States (also nearby is the Cahokia Diversion Canal), and subsequently a Traditional Navigable Water. The outside perimeter of the pond was reviewed for the presence of any outflow structures. No outflow structures were observed; however, a single inlet carrying stormwater from the refinery entered Smith Lake in the southwest corner, and a second inlet was observed on the northwest side. From our on-site observation, it was clear that the pond was not utilized as part of the refinery operations for ConocoPhillips, but mostly as a catchment for stormwater. There were no nearby buildings or a structure indicating the pond is used as part of the refinery’s operations (i.e. cooling).

FEMA maps were reviewed, and it was identified that the 100/500 - year floodplain envelops most of the blueline system. However, areas surrounding the blueline system and its floodplain are not mapped as 100 or 500 year floodplain. Zone C, which is a zone denoted as "areas of minimal flooding" and does not have a floodplain designation, surrounds the full perimeter of this "blueline" watercourse. The floodplain designation is associated only with internal flooding, which supports Mr. Rankin's description of what occurs during wet weather. The floodplain does not extend or provide a connection to the nearest Traditional Navigable Water, which is the Mississippi River. Four municipalities also separate this blueline system from the Mississippi River, which are the City's of Wood River, Hartford, Roxanna, and South Roxanna.

Where does the water go? It is anticipated that some of the water generated in the headwaters is now diverted through the retention pond constructed for State Highway 255. The St. Louis District has also read two reports provided by two different consulting engineers for ConocoPhillips, and the reports indicated that some water may be lost through groundwater infiltration. The two consulting engineers also agreed there is no outlet for the water. Only inlets to Smith Lake exist. The two reports were generated for ConocoPhillips site planning purposes, and in also in association with the RCRA site.

In conclusion, the YTB Property contains a wetland that is part of a blueline system that terminates at Smith Lake. The conditions of the on-site wetland are presumed to be a result of upstream dewatering and siltation. The dewatering may be caused by the retention of stormwater within a large retention pond constructed by IDOT. Downstream of the YTB property, no outflow structures were observed to be exiting Smith Lake. Smith Lake, as well as the entire blueline system are mapped to be within the 100/500 - year floodplain, but that is result of internal flooding. The entire system is encapsulated by non-floodplain conditions, and is separated from the Mississippi River by a conglomeration of several small municipalities (i.e., Wood River, Roxanna, South Roxanna, and Harford). As a result of this information, as well as discussions with property owners, site civil engineers, two site visits, and much evaluation and debate within the St. Louis District, the wetland, lake, and the entire blueline system have been determined to be isolated.

A review of the current conditions onsite reveal that the area has remained unchanged since the site visits in 2007. There are no issues currently that would cause the previous determination to be changed.

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: **acres**
 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:

Tributary stream order, if known: .

(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:

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

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

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks

OHWM⁵ (check all indicators that apply):

clear, natural line impressed on the bank

changes in the character of soil

shelving

vegetation matted down, bent, or absent

leaf litter disturbed or washed away

sediment deposition

water staining

other (list):

Discontinuous OHWM.⁶ Explain:

the presence of litter and debris

destruction of terrestrial vegetation

the presence of wrack line

sediment sorting

scour

multiple observed or predicted flow events

abrupt change in plant community

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

High Tide Line indicated by:

oil or scum line along shore objects

fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)

physical markings/characteristics

tidal gauges

other (list):

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:

survey to available datum;

physical markings;

vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.

(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:.

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

Riparian corridor.

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:

⁵A 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.

⁶Ibid.

- (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: Emergent habitat consisting of mostly 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:

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:

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

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.**
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-RPWs⁷ 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 abutting to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

⁷See Footnote # 3.

- 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.⁸

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):⁹

- 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). **See explanation in B2.**
- Waters do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: .
- 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: 1.2 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.

⁸ To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

⁹ 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.

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: .
- 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: Wood River Quad.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Wood River Quad.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):.
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):.
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):Field review of the YTB International property on November 28, 2007 and Conoco Phillips property on December 17, 2007.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: