

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): 1 October 2019

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Portland District, Salem Keizer School District (Institutional Development)
NWP-2019-198 (JD Form 1 of 1)

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Oregon County/parish/borough: Marion City: Salem
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 44.96258° **N**, Long. 122.9988° **W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Landing Park Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: The aquatic resources does not flow off site. The nearest TNW is the Willamette River.

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Glenn Creek - Willamette River (170900070303)

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: 3 September 2019

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 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: acres.

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

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
Explain: The Corps identified Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F as non-regulated wetland. Refer to Section F for additional information.

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 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: **Pick List**

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: .

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: .

Tributary stream order, if known: .

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.

(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:

Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:

- Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

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

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

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

(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:

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(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: acres

Wetland type. Explain:

Wetland quality. Explain:

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain:

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics:

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

Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Directly abutting

Not directly abutting

Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:

Ecological connection. Explain:

Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** floodplain.

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain:
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

3. **Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)**

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres) Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres)

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW. Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the *Rapanos* Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below:

1. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D: .
2. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D: .
3. **Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D: .

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:
 TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.
2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
 Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: .
 Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally: .

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-RPWs⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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

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

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
 Other non-wetland waters: acres.
Identify type(s) of waters: .

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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

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

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.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: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

¹⁰Prior 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.

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): Although the review area provides wetland habitat appropriate for migratory bird species, the wetland would not attract interstate or foreign recreational commerce due to wetland's small size and land setting lacking access to recreational and/or commercial use or purposes.

Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F lack of interstate commerce connection:

1. Lack of interstate use by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational purposes.
 - a. Lack of habitat or resources of special significance which would attract interstate or foreign travelers.
 - b. Lack of bird and wildlife species of special significance which would attract interstate or foreign travelers.
2. Lack of fish or shellfish which could be taken or sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
3. Lack of industrial purposes (e.g., water withdrawal for industrial use) .
4. Lack of agriculture which is sold interstate/foreign.
5. Lack of silviculture which is sold interstate/foreign.

Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F are flat and depressional wetlands and do not meet the criteria of adjacency to traditionally navigable waters (TNW), relatively permanent waters (RPW), or non-relatively permanent waters (non-RPW). Aerial imagery, the National Hydrography Dataset, and Topographic maps detail the location of the nearest waters of the United States. The nearest TNW is the Willamette River, approximately 1.74 miles away; the nearest RPW is Landing Park Creek, at least 1,845 feet away.

Geographic and hydrologic isolation:

1. Absence of any surface drainage features between the isolated water and the nearest water of the U.S (WoUS).

There are no surface drainage features between the isolated Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F and the Landing Park Creek.

2. Absence (or presence) of any berms between the isolated water and the nearest water of the U.S.

There are artificial physical barriers between Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F and the RPW as the review area has been surrounded by residential development and roads.

3. Horizontal and vertical distance to the nearest water of the U.S.

Horizontal distance from Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F to the Landing Park Creek is 1,845 feet.

Vertical distance from the Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F to the Landing Park Creek is approximately 0 feet. This was calculated by using elevation lines on USGS topography maps by taking the difference between the approximate lowest elevation of the wetlands (174 feet) and the estimated lowest elevation in Landing Park Creek (174 feet). However, the grade over the review area to Landing Park Creek is comprised of upland areas as high as 180 feet, including the road footprint of Landing Avenue Northeast abutting the review area to the west.

4. Source of hydrology for the isolated water
 - a. Precipitation, seeps? Overland flow?

Source of hydrology for the isolated Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F is primarily from precipitation, additionally Wetland A is irrigated throughout the year. See also item 9 below.

- b. Could the nearest water of the U.S., during extreme floods, overflow into the isolated water?

Under past and current conditions runoff water on adjacent properties would only minimally flow to the review area as most of the runoff is diverted into municipal stormwater sewer systems. It would be extremely unlikely that the Landing Park Creek floodwaters would reach the review area. Additionally, due to the distance between Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F and the Landing Park Creek and due to runoff being diverted into municipal stormwater sewer systems in the residential development areas between the wetlands and Landing Park Creek, it would be extremely unlikely that the Landing Park Creek floodwaters would reach the review area.

5. During extreme storm/flood conditions, could the isolated water "overflow" into the nearest water of the U.S.?

Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F could potentially overflow into municipal stormwater sewer systems which eventually discharge into the Willamette River. Only in the utmost extreme conditions would this be possible.

6. Description of the intervening land between the isolated water and the nearest water of the U.S. (potential for shallow subsurface connection)

The land between the review area and Landing Park Creek has been developed into residential subdivisions and major roads.

- a. The area of the isolated wetlands has no tree cover as most of the vegetation is consistently mowed and is part of an athletic field or between heavily used buildings which are part of the school facility.
- b. It is primarily vegetated with Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*, FAC), tall false-rye grass (*Schedonorus arundinaceus*, FAC), and bent grasses (*Agrostis spp.*, FAC)
- c. The review area provides habitat to song and water birds as well as insects which provide a food source for aquatic species.

7. Mapped or actual soil types on- and off-site (potential for shallow subsurface connection)

The review area is approximately 85% Concord silt loam– Poorly drained; slow runoff or ponded; very slow permeability, hydric. The remaining 25% of the review area is Woodburn silt loam (non-hydric) which has been entirely developed as part of the school facilities.

8. Floodplain designation, if any, of the area where the isolated water is located in relation to the nearest water of the U.S.

FEMA has mapped this area as Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard, indicating the area has less than a 0.2-percent annual chance of flooding.

9. Proof of absence of shallow subsurface connection (e.g., waterwells, geologic analysis, dye test, etc)

Wetlands A, B, C, D, E, and F appear to be isolated wetlands which collect direct precipitation, irrigation water, and minimal overland flow water from the north and east enters the site as runoff from the abutting developments. There may be localized shallow subsurface connection within the review area, however due to surrounding development a connection to downstream waters via shallow subsurface groundwater flow is unlikely.

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: 1.87 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.

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: Included in the Wetland Delineation prepared by Pacific Habitat Services, Inc., 18 February 2019
- 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: Glenn Creek - Willamette River (170900070303).
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: 1:24K, OR - Salem East.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Figure 4 from the Wetland Delineation prepared by Pacific Habitat Services, Inc., 18 February 2019.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s National Wetland Inventory mapper accessed 4 September 2019; no NWI wetlands mapped on site.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Figure 3 from the Wetland Delineation prepared by Pacific Habitat Services, Inc., 18 February 2019; no LWI wetlands mapped on site.
- FEMA/FIRM maps: FEMA Map No. 41047C0375G, effective date 19 January 2000.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Figure 5 from the Wetland Delineation prepared by Pacific Habitat Services, Inc., 18 February 2019 and Google Earth September 2019.

or Other (Name & Date): Photos A - J from the Wetland Delineation prepared by Pacific Habitat Services, Inc., 18 February 2019.

- 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: The review area totals approximately 14.4 acres. The review area taxlot is located within the city of Salem, Marion County, Oregon. Residential land uses are occurring within the vicinity of the taxlot. The delineation titled, Wetland Delineation for the Waldo Middle School, Salem, Oregon conducted by Pacific Habitat Services, Inc dated 18 February 2019 identified six wetlands (Wetlands A - F). The field visits for the wetland delineations were conducted by the consultant on 21 November 2018.

Wetland A is a 1.69-acre palustrine emergent, flat wetland. Wetland A receives hydrology primarily from precipitation and irrigation. Soils in Wetland A are mapped as hydric Concord Silt Loam. Dominant vegetation includes Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*, FAC), tall false-rye grass (*Schedonorus arundinaceus*, FAC), and bent grasses (*Agrostis* spp., FAC).

Wetland B is a 0.09-acre palustrine emergent, depressional wetland. Wetland B receives hydrology primarily from precipitation. Soils in Wetland B are mapped as hydric Concord Silt Loam. Dominant vegetation includes bent grasses (*Agrostis* spp., FAC), hairy cat's ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*, FACU), and hawkbit (*Leontodon saxatilis*, FACU).

Wetland C is a 0.001-acre palustrine emergent, depressional wetland. Wetland C receives hydrology primarily from precipitation. Soils in Wetland C are mapped as hydric Concord Silt Loam. Dominant vegetation includes bent grasses (*Agrostis* spp., FAC), hairy cat's ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*, FACU), and hawkbit (*Leontodon saxatilis*, FACU).

Wetland D is a 0.04-acre palustrine emergent, depressional wetland. Wetland D receives hydrology primarily from precipitation. Soils in Wetland D are mapped as hydric Concord Silt Loam. Dominant vegetation includes bent grasses (*Agrostis* spp., FAC), hairy cat's ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*, FACU), and hawkbit (*Leontodon saxatilis*, FACU).

Wetland E is a 0.04-acre palustrine emergent, depressional wetland. Wetland E receives hydrology primarily from precipitation. Soils in Wetland E are mapped as hydric Concord Silt Loam. Dominant vegetation includes bent grasses (*Agrostis* spp., FAC), hairy cat's ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*, FACU), and hawkbit (*Leontodon saxatilis*, FACU).

Wetland F is a 0.02-acre palustrine emergent, depressional wetland. Wetland F receives hydrology primarily from precipitation. Soils in Wetland F are mapped as hydric Concord Silt Loam. Dominant vegetation includes bent grasses (*Agrostis* spp., FAC). Wetland F extends off site to the west along a roadside. Based on topography it is not anticipated Wetland F extends to reach off-site storm sewer infrastructure.

E-mail coordination was sent to the EPA and Corps Headquarters on 9 September 2019 requesting response within 21 days. Response was not received by the Corps Headquarters. Response was received by EPA on 18 Sept 2019; their comments regarding bolstering the hydrological isolation explanation in Section F have been incorporated into this AJD.