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 20, 2022

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Mobile District, Johnny Moore, SAM-2014-01068-SBC

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State:Alabama County/parish/borough: Baldwin City: Orange Beach
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 30.227209° **N**, Long. -87.574258° **W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator:
Name of nearest waterbody:
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows:
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC):

☒ 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 20, 2022
☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Pick List** "*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 **Pick List** "*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: 214 linear feet: width (ft) and/or 0.02 acres.
      Wetlands: acres.

   c. **Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction** based on: **Pick List**
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

2. **Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):**[3]
   ☐ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
   Explain: .

[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: **Cotton Bayou**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: Cotton Bayou is subject to the ebb and flow of the tide, and provides navigable connection to the Gulf of Mexico to the south. This water is used both in interstate commerce and recreationally for seafood harvest and navigational recreation.

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: 187,344 **acres**
Drainage area: 672 **acres**
Average annual rainfall: 65 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 **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: .

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

Identify flow route to TNW[5]: The feature drains year-round to the property to the east. It terminates into a tidal marsh wetland approximately 70 feet from the propoerty boundary and is directly adjacent and hydrologically connected to Cotton Bayou, a TNW.

Tributary stream order, if known: The tributary is a first order, man-altered tributary, which drains the wetlands and tidal creek to the west, and serves as a continuous hydrologic surface connection to the TNW.

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

Tributary is: ☒ Natural

☒ Artificial (man-made). Explain: Properties to the east and west of the parcel under review feature a natural creek. The creek on the subject property has been incrementally altered over the years, but has existed as a tributary to Cotton Bayou draining surrounding wetlands in Orange Beach since aerial imagery has been available in 1955. The municipality has altered drainage patterns in surrounding neighborhoods to drain to this creek, which has been ditched and culverted in some places to also function as stormwater management. However, this property is surrounded by two wetland areas (of varying manipulated status) that are bisected by a tidally-influenced creek.

☒ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: The creek has been totally filled and the connection to Cotton Bayou severed completely by two bulkheads on either side of this parcel, acting as walls to inhibit flow. Prior to this fill, it existed as a ditch dug from the existing creek. Portions of this creek are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide, but due to the alterations, there is not enough data to confirm on this parcel. A permit issued for the adjacent marina under file number AL84-00128-L confirm the status of this water as a creek.

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

Average width: 10 feet

Average depth: 1 feet

Average side slopes: **Pick List.**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

☒ Silts	☒ Sands	☐ Concrete
☐ Cobbles	☐ Gravel	☒ Muck
☐ Bedrock	☐ Vegetation. Type/% cover:	

☒ Other. Explain: The creek has been filled entirely with commercially obtained sand and other material.

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: The creek was a manipulated drainage features flowing to tidal marsh wetlands and functioning as perennial water. Aerial photos on Digital Globe, Google Earth, and Baldwin County EagleView exhibit geomorphically stable conditions, lacking evidence of erosion and very little incision. Due to lack of vegetation along banks, stabilty is believed to have been managed by continued maintenance and man-made alterations. .

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: No.

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20 (or greater)**

Describe flow regime: All available aerial imagery prior to fill shows standing and flowing water in the creek. Desktop review found that the creek under review has perrennial features, totaling 113.77 linear feet, with continuous OHWM and the continuity of bed and bank due to its maintained status. All available aerial imagery indicates constant presence of surface water.

Other information on duration and volume: Site specific streamflow data is not available for the features due to a lack of guages within proximity of the review area; however statistical data obtained for the 627-acre drainage area described above, estimates that the subject features provide an estimated mean annual flow of 2.56 cubic feet per second, with a 50-percent annual exceedance probability (AEP) peak flow of 249 cubic-feet-per-second, which would occur at least once every two-years. Flow within the above described tributary is experienced for a duration sufficient to exhibit evidence of surface water or recent inundation with clear biological and geological diversity.

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined.** Characteristics: Flow within the creek is estimated to have been confined within a 1.09 foot deep channel with indications of perennial flow.

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

☐ 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

[5] Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.

[6] A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

- ☐ 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):
- ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- ☐ the presence of wrack line
- ☐ sediment sorting
- ☐ scour
- ☐ multiple observed or predicted flow events
- ☒ abrupt change in plant community

☐ 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:
- ☐ 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: Surface waters matching the color and apparent water quality of Cotton Bayou are present in all available aerial imagery. The creek transitions to a wetland that is tidally influenced and directly adjacent to Cotton Bayou.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Drone photos taken after the fill show the adjacent wetland and creek to be ponded and sufficiently deep to support aquatic habitat but polluted by sediment from the fill and sheet pile installation. Prior to this activity, all available imagery shows surface waters matching the adjacent bayou and bisecting three contiguous lots.

[7] Ibid.

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

☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .

☒ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: Juncus roemerianus lined the channel prior to construction, some of which has been replanted at the east fringes of the propery under review.

☒ Habitat for:

☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .

☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .

☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .

☒ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: Prior to fill, the tributary would have provided foraging habitat for aquatic wildlife.

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: Although a Significant Nexus determination is not typically required for an RPW or wetlands abutting an RPW, a Significant Nexus determination was made in this case due to the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals decision in U.S. v. Robison et.al. (October 24, 2007). The US v. Robison decision concluded that Justice Kennedy's "significant nexus" test provides the governing rule of Rapanos and Clean Water Act jurisdiction for all waters that are not TNWs or wetlands adjacent to TNWs, and therefore all affirmative AJDs in the State of Alabama require a Significant Nexus analysis, except for TNWs and their adjacent or abutting wetlands. Physical functions provided by the creek and adjacent off-site wetlands include flood water attenuation, sediment trapping, and flow management of precipitation runoff for the subject drainage area which encompasses 627 acres. It is estimated that rainfall in the area measures approximately 64 inches per year, and the subject feature provides a mean annual flow of 2.56 cubic feet per second, with a 50-percent annual exceedance probability (AEP) peak flow of 249 cubic-feet-per-second. This input contributes to the functions of attentuation and flow management of surface water run-off in the review area. Hydrologic inputs in the review area would likely contain chemicals associated with waste, vehicle pollution fertilizers, and stormwater management, typical of an increasingly developed, altered environment. The creek serves as a conveyance of detritus, nutrients, organic carbon to downstream waters and aquatic food webs and provides habitat for small amphibians, reptiles, and birds. Adjacent wetlands both upstream and downstream of the review area continue to drain to an adjacent tidally-influenced marsh area approximately 70 feet east of the property and provide the continued absorption of excess nutrients and filtration of pollutants prior to waters reaching the TNW. During a 1984-1985 permit evaluation (under file number AL84-00128-L) to develop the lot to the west of the subject property, the resource under review was continuously referred to as a "tidal creek" and the adjacent tidal marsh lining this resource upstream was protected from impacts. That property owner was required to build a bridge to cross the creek, indicating that this resource has existed long before increasing development of Orange Beach manipulated the area to serve stormwater manmagement

functions. Because the remaining adjacent and abutting wetlands in the surrounding area still flow through this creek, the review area was found to have more than a speculative effect on the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the downstream TNW, Cotton Bayou, and therefore a significant nexus does exist.

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: Prior to fill in the creek, over 20 available aerial images from 1955-2019 show continuous surface water in the channel, which appears to have been incrementally altered in recent years. Some channelization through construction of a bulkhead-type structure surrounding the creek occurred after 2004, but the tributary still exhibited standing and flowing surface water and acted as a direct connection between wetlands and a 672-acre drainage area near Cotton Bayou. Approximately 70 feet to the east on the adjoining property, the creek transitions to tidally-influenced marsh with a direct connection to Cotton Bayou. During heavy rainfall and storm events, the entire creek area and surrounding wetlands are flooded.
   - ☐ 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.**

[8]See 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.[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: .
☐ Other: (explain, if not covered above): .

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all that apply):

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

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):

☐ 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.

[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.*

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:National Regulatory Viewer: NHD and HUC layers; Digital Elevation Models.
  - ☒ USGS NHD data.
  - ☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: .
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:USDA WesSoil Survey - SSURGO (Export 09/13/21).
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:National Regulatory Viewer: USFWS NWI Mapper.
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date):1955, 1960, 1992, 1994, 2006, 2010, 2012, 2015, 2018, 2019, 2020 aerials from UA Aerial image archive, Google Earth, Baldwin County Eagle View.
  or ☒ Other (Name & Date):Photos submitted by complainant on June 22, 2020.
- ☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- ☐ Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: A complaint regarding the unauthorized fill and structures in WOUS at this location was received in the Mobile District Regulatory Division office on June 22, 2020. A Notice of Potential Violation letter was issued to the property owner on August 21, 2020. A partial response was received from the property owner's agent on August 28, 2020, but a complete response was not received until July 6, 2021. An Approved Jurisdictional Determination was requested by the property owner's agent on July 27, 2021, asserting that this resource, which was filled without authorization, was not jurisdictional.

The property to the west of the parcel under review contains the Romar Marina, which was originally permitted in 1985 by Mobile District under file number AL84-00128-L. The permit and SOF repeatedly refer to the tidal creek that crosses the property. That creek, though also altered today, still exhibits wetland and surface water characteristics as evidenced in all available aerial imagery. Permit conditions for the Romar Marina development specify "The tidal creek and adjacent wetland shall not be dredged or filled" and that all impacts are to occur "landward of the tidal creek transecting the site". Those statements refer to the same resource under review in this document. Additionally, the SOF states that, during a site inspection, the western property "was observed to be transected by an undisturbed tidal creek, with the area landward of the creek wooded with loblolly pines, but grubbed of all understory vegetation. The Cotton Bayou shoreline was fringed with Juncus roemerianus, quickly rising to a primordial dune system waterward of the tidal creek." Furthermore, the record states that "a 3-to 6-foot tidal creek transects the lot, running west to east, approximately 120 feet from the water's edge and joining the bayou approximately 120 feet east of the property line… A surface drainage ditch directs runoff from wetlands located across Garrett's drive into the tidal creek west of the project site", supporting the assertion that this water received flow from surrounding wetlands and waters prior to alteration.