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

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): August 23, 2016
B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: CELRI-OPF-N, Speedway #100823, LRL-2016-790-jlt
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Indiana  County/parish/borough: Clay
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 39.45253173° N, Long. -87.12814488° W
   Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16
   Name of nearest waterbody: Little Birch Creek (located just north of the review area)
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Wabash River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 051202050601
   ☑ Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
   ☐ Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc...) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   ☑ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: August 22, 2016
   ☐ Field Determination. Date(s): Click here to enter a date., Click here to enter a date.

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: Click here to enter text.

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 (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: width (ft) and/or acres.
         Wetlands: N/A acres.
      c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on:
         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: The drainage swale within the review area/boundary (see attached 2 aerial photos) that runs from W County Road 450 N in a northern direction for approximately 500 feet in length to the edge of the forested area does not contain a bed or bank or a wetland and therefore is not jurisdictional.

---

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.
V. 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: Click here to enter text.

☐ Other: (explain, if not covered above): Click here to enter text.

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: Click here to enter text.

☐ 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: Click here to enter text.

☐ Wetlands: # acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Click here to enter text.

☒ 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: Click here to enter text.

☒ Corps navigable waters’ study: Click here to enter text.

☒ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Click here to enter text.

☒ USGS NHD data.

☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.

☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Click here to enter text.

☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Click here to enter text.

☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: The NWI map showed a stream and 3 wetlands north of the review area. The NWI map did not show any WOUs in the review area.

☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Click here to enter text.

☒ FEMA/FIRM maps: Click here to enter text.

☒ 100-year Floodplain Elevation: The 100 year flood plain was shown just north of the review area. (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)

☒ Photographs: ☑ Aerial (Name & Date): Aerial photos going back to 1992 showed no change in the review area.

☐ or ☑ Other (Name & Date): The 31 photographs did not show a bed and bank within the drainage swale. The photos were taken in April 2016.

☒ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: Click here to enter text.

☒ Applicable/supporting case law: Click here to enter text.

☒ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: Click here to enter text.

☒ Other information (please specify): Click here to enter text.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

[Signature]
James Thomas
Project Manager

[Signature]
August 23, 2016
Date