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 3, 2015

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: CELRL-OPF-N, Martin Farms #3 Violation, LRL-2014-921-lae

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Indiana County/parish/borough: Hendricks County City: near Stilesville
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 39.60711 °, Long. -86.61427 °
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
Name of nearest waterbody: Mud Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: White River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 05120203 - Eel

☑ 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: October 28, 2014

☑ Field Determination. Date: October 27, 2014

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.

☐ 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.

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: 2,669 linear feet: 1 width (ft) and/or 0.06 acres.
Wetlands: 0 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM

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:

Summarize rationale supporting determination:

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent":

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

This section summarizes information regarding characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under *Rapanos* have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are "relatively permanent waters" (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant nexus evaluation. Corps districts and EPA regions will include in the record any available information that documents the existence of a significant nexus between a relatively permanent tributary that is not perennial (and its adjacent wetlands if any) and a traditional navigable water, even though a significant nexus finding is not required as a matter of law.

If the waterbody[4] is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) General Area Conditions:
Watershed size: 14 digit HUC is 6,948 acres
Drainage area: Trib A has approximately 53 acres of drainage area, and Trib B has approximately 30 acres of drainage area.

(ii) Physical Characteristics:
(a) Relationship with TNW:

☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
☑ Tributaries flow through 3 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 118.5 river miles from a TNW (Located at the beginning of the White River's designation as a TNW, 66.2 miles above its mouth to the Wabash River.)
Project waters are 1.5 river miles from RPW. (For this analysis we used the tribs connections to Mud Creek, a blue line perennial RPW.)
Project waters are 75 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1.5 aerial (straight) miles from RPW. (For this analysis we used the tribs connections to Mud Creek, a blue line perennial RPW.)
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A
Identify flow route to TNW[5]: Tribs A and B flow to (1)Mud Creek, (2) Mill Creek, (3) Eel River, and into the (4) White River, a TNW. The White River then flows into the Wabash River, another TNW.
Tributary stream order, if known: First Order

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

Tributary is:
☑ Natural
☐ Artificial (man-made). Explain:
☑ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: These streams were natural until the violation occurred in 2011 and 2012. The violation involved the clearing, grading, and encapsulation of these stream channels.

[4] Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
[5] Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
Average width: 1 feet
Average depth: .5 feet
Average side slopes: 3:1

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

☑ Silts	☐ Sands	☐ Concrete
☑ Cobbles	☐ Gravel	☐ Muck
☐ Bedrock	☑ Vegetation. Type/% cover: 100% cover before tree clearing occurred.	
☐ Other. Explain:		

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Probably stable with sediment deposits from the adjacent crop fields.
Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: None. These streams have ephemeral and intermittent flow.
Tributary geometry: Meandering
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 2%

(c) Flow:
Tributary provides for: ephemeral and intermittent flow
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: 20 (or greater)
Describe flow regime: 24 hours after a rain event for the ephemeral tributaries, and approximately 3 months out of the year with a ground water influence for the intermittent tributary.
Other information on duration and volume: N/A
Surface flow is: Discrete and Confined Characteristics: Water was present within Intermittent Stream A during the field investigation on October 27, 2014, and the surface flow within the ephemeral streams is evident by the OHWM visible in aerial photography from 2005 and 2011 when leaf cover is down within this previously forested area.
Subsurface flow: Yes Explain findings: Intermittent Stream A has ground water influenced flow. There was water within this stream channel at the time of the field investigation on October 27, 2014, and the most recent rainfall within this area was 6 days prior to the investigation. In addition, this intermittent stream was encapsulated during the violation activity. However, the entrance and exit of the pipe was observed during the field investigation.
☐ Dye (or other) test performed:

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

☑ clear, natural line impressed on the bank	☐ the presence of litter and debris
☐ changes in the character of soil	☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☐ shelving	☐ the presence of wrack line
☑ vegetation matted down, bent, or absent	☐ sediment sorting
☐ leaf litter disturbed or washed away	☐ scour
☐ sediment deposition	☐ multiple observed or predicted flow events
☐ water staining	☐ abrupt change in plant community
☑ other (list): OHWM is visible in aerial photography when leaf cover is off the surrounding trees.	

☐ Discontinuous OHWM.[7] Explain:

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

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

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Explain: The observable water within Intermittent Stream A was clear during the field investigation on October 27, 2014.

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

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Pollutants are washed from the adjacent crop fields into these stream channels. These pollutants include sediment, pesticides, and fertilizer (nitrogen and phosphorus).

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

- ☑ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): A forested riparian zone on all the identified stream channels was present before the violation activity occurred. The riparian zone on average was over a 100 feet wide on each side of the stream channels.
- ☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics:
- ☑ Habitat for:
  - ☑ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: The forested riparian corridor previously surrounding the intermittent stream channel may have provided habitat for the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and the threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). Bother protected bat species find habitat within riparian corridors near RPWs.
  - ☐ 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 N/A

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties:
Wetland size:
Wetland type. Explain:
Wetland quality. Explain:
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is : Explain:

Surface flow is:
Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: Yes 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 river miles from TNW.
Project waters are aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from:
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the 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) N/A

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis:
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:
   Tributaries A and B have the capacity to carry pollutants from the adjacent crop fields such as sediment, pesticides, and fertilizer into the White River, a TNW, which then flows into the Wabash River, a TNW. Before this area was mechanically cleared of trees, the forested riparian zone would have filtered some of these pollutants out before entering these tributaries and prevented these pollutants from entering downstream tributaries. In addition, the forested riparian zone would have likely retained some local flood waters. The physical, chemical, and biological integrity of these tributaries influence the integrity of the downstream TNWs because these tributaries convey pollutants and nutrients downstream. Before the tributaries were cleared of their forested riparian zone, less pollutants and more beneficial nutrients were transported to downstream tributaries and TNWs.

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: Intermittent Stream A has ground water influenced flow. There was water within this stream channel at the time of the field investigation on October 27, 2014, and the most recent rainfall within this area was 6 days prior to the investigation.

     Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
     - ☑ Tributary waters: 547 linear feet, 1 width (ft).
     - ☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
       Identify type(s) of waters:

3. **Non-RPWs[8] that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - [x] Waterbody that is not a TNW or a 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):
   - [x] Tributary waters: 2,122 linear feet, 1 width (ft).
   - [ ] Other non-wetland waters: acres.
     Identify type(s) of waters:

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

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

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

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

6. **Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - [ ] Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

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.

[8] See Footnote # 3.
[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.*

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.

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: See AJD – Fig 1 and 2 in pdf
- ☐ 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: Hall, Indiana 1:24K Quad
- ☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:
- ☐ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps:
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☑ Photographs: ☐ Aerial (Name & Date):
- ☐ or ☑ Other (Name & Date): Field Investigation 10/27/2014 Photo Log
- ☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law:
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- ☑ Other information (please specify):
  - Corps Documentation of Field Investigation "MFR #3 Martin Violation Investigation October 27, 2014
  - Corps Documents titled "additional documents 6-15-2015" displaying aerial photography from 1998 – 2014 and a soil survey from 1974.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: This approved JD is associated with a violation that discharged fill material within 2,669 linear feet of stream channels in order to expand adjacent crop fields. The Corps C&D letter sent out to the violator, Mr. Merlin Martin, is dated March 12, 2015.


Estill/OPF-N
McKay/OPF-N


ESTILL.LESLIE.A.1386571968

Digitally signed by ESTILL.LESLIE.A.1386571968
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=USA, cn=ESTILL.LESLIE.A.1386571968
Date: 2015.08.03 14:33:14 -04'00'

MCKAY.GREGORY.ALLEN.1230307071

Digitally signed by MCKAY.GREGORY.ALLEN.1230307071
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=USA, cn=MCKAY.GREGORY.ALLEN.1230307071
Date: 2015.08.03 15:42:17 -04'00'


Approved JD (LRL-2014-921)
Tributaries A = 1,400 liner feet
Tributaries B = 1,269 linear feet
Ephemeral Stream A - 558 lf
Intermittent Stream A - 547 lf
Ephemeral Stream A - 295 lf
34
Ephemeral Stream B - 1,099 lf
Ephemeral Stream B - 170 lf
800
Google earth
© 2015 Google
1000 ft
N


Approved JD (LRL-2014-921)
Tributaries A = 1,400 liner feet
Tributaries B = 1,269 linear feet
Aerial 8/29/2012
Ephemeral Stream A - 558 lf
Intermittent Stream A - 547 lf
Ephemeral Stream A - 295 lf
Ephemeral Stream B - 1,099 lf
Ephemeral Stream B - 170 lf
Google earth
Image USDA Farm Service Agency
N
1000 ft