## 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**

Α.	REPORT COMP	LETION DATE FOR A	APPROVED JURISDIC	TIONAL DETERMINATION	(JD): October 7, 2022
----	-------------	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Sacramento District, South Valley Regional Airport West Jordan Utah. SPK-2012-00518-UO C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: State: Utah County: Salt Lake County City: West Jordan Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 40.61101°, Long. -111.99449° Universal Transverse Mercator: 12 415870.68 4496052.88 Name of nearest waterbody: Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Bingham Creek Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Jordan, 16020204 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 7, 2022 ☐ 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 waters<sup>2</sup> (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, wide, and/or acres. Wetlands: 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: The potential aquatic resources within the study area did not have Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) characteristics in accordance with Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) 05-05.

## **SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS**

<sup>1</sup> Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

**Enclosure 3** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

#### 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<sup>4</sup> 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 TNW<sup>5</sup>:

Tributary stream order, if known:

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 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 is:	☐ Natural ☐ Artificial (man-made). Explain: ☐ Manipulated (man-altered). Exp	φlain:	
	Average wid Average de		imate):	
	Primary tributary Silts Cobbles Bedrock Other. E.	☐ Vegetation. Type/% co	☐ Concrete ☐ Muck	
	Presence of run/ Tributary geome	on/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloud friffle/pool complexes. Explain: stry: <b>Pick List</b> nt (approximate average slope):	ughing banks]. Explain:	
(c)	Describe flo	e number of flow events in review are	rea/year: <b>Pick List</b>	
	Surface flow is:	Pick List. Characteristics:		
		: <b>Pick List</b> . Explain findings: other) test performed:		
	☐ Bed and ☐ OHWM <sup>6</sup> ☐ clear, ☐ chan, ☐ shelv ☐ veget ☐ leaf li ☐ sedin ☐ water	(check all indicators that apply): , natural line impressed on the bank ges in the character of soil ing tation matted down, bent, or absent itter disturbed or washed away ment deposition r staining	☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation☐ the presence of wrack line	
	apply): ☐ High Tid ☐ oil or ☐ fine s ☐ physi ☐ tidal (	nan the OHWM were used to determine the condition of the	nine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that  Mean High Water Mark indicated by:  survey to available datum; physical markings; vegetation lines/changes in vegetation type	
Cha cl	emical Character aracterize tributary haracteristics, etc ntify specific pollu	y (e.g., water color is clear, discolore ). Explain:	ed, oily film; water quality; general watershed	
		ristics. Channel supports (check a Characteristics (type, average width haracteristics:		

(iii)

(iv)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>lbid.

			Habitat for:			
			Federally Listed spec			
			Fish/spawn areas. Ex		lain finalinas	
			☐ Aquatic/wildlife divers	y-sensitive species. Exp	iain findings:	
				ory. Explain infairigo.		
2.	Cha	arac	teristics of wetlands adj	acent to non-TNW that	flow directly or indirectly in	nto TNW
	(i)		ysical Characteristics:			
		(a)	General Wetland Charace Properties:	cteristics:		
			Wetland size:	acres		
			Wetland type. Explai			
			Wetland quality. Exp		des Frantsis	
			Project wetlands cross of	or serve as state boundar	ries. Expiain:	
		(b)	General Flow Relationsh			
			Flow is: <b>Pick List</b> . Expla	nin:		
			Surface flow is: Pick Lis	st		
			Characteristics:			
			Subsurface flow: Pick L	ist Evolain findings:		
			Dye (or other) tes			
		(0)	Watland Adiaconay Date	armination with Non TNIV	u.	
		(0)	Wetland Adjacency Dete	emmadon with Non-miv	<u>v.</u>	
			☐ Not directly abutting			
				hydrologic connection. E	xplain:	
			☐ Ecological connec			
			☐ Separated by ber	m/bamer. Expiain.		
		(d)	Proximity (Relationship)			
			Project wetlands are Pick			
			Project waters are <b>Pick</b> Flow is from: <b>Pick List.</b>	List aeriai (straignt) mile	S Irom Tinvv.	
				cation of wetland as with	nin the <b>Pick List</b> floodplain.	
	/ii\	Ch	emical Characteristics:			
	(11)			ı (e.g., water color is clea	ar, brown, oil film on surface; v	water quality; general watershed
		С	haracteristics; etc.). Expla	ain:	, ,	1 77 3
		lde	ntify specific pollutants, if	known:		
	(iii)	Bio	logical Characteristics.	Wetland supports (che	eck all that apply):	
	` '		Riparian buffer. Characte	ristics (type, average wid		
			Vegetation type/percent o	over. Explain:		
		Ш	Habitat for: ☐ Federally Listed spec	ries Explain findings		
			Fish/spawn areas. Ex			
			Other environmentall	y-sensitive species. Exp	lain findings:	
			Aquatic/wildlife divers	sity. Explain findings:		
3.	Cha		teristics of all wetlands			
			wetland(s) being consider			
		App	oroximately acres i	n total are being conside	red in the cumulative analysis	5.
		For	each wetland, specify the	e following:		
			Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)	Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)
			- <del></del>	- <del></del>		· —

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:

- 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, wide, 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 wide.  Other non-wetland waters: acres.  Identify type(s) of waters:
3.	Non-RPWs <sup>8</sup> 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, wide.

<sup>8</sup>See Footnote #3.

	☐ 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:
	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).
WA	DLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, GRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH TERS (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:
lde	ntify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:
	vide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply): Tributary waters: linear feet, wide. Other non-wetland waters: acres. Identify type(s) of waters: Wetlands: acres.
	N-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).

E.

F.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

☐ Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: ☐ Other: (explain, if not covered above): Aquatic resources did not have OHWM characteristics based on
RGL 05-05  Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> 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, wide.  Lakes/ponds: acres.  Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:
<ul> <li>☐ Wetlands: acres.</li> <li>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):</li> <li>☐ Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet, wide.</li> <li>☐ Lakes/ponds: acres.</li> <li>☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:</li> <li>☐ Wetlands: acres.</li> </ul> SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.
<ul> <li>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):         <ul> <li>Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: "Aquatic Resources Delineation, South Valley Regional Airport, 7365 South 4450 West, West Jordan, Utah" dated August 2022 prepared by Natural Resource Consulting.</li> <li>Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.</li></ul></li></ul>
□ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929) □ Photographs: □ Aerial (Name & Date): GoogleEarth 7.3.3.7692. (Historic Aerial Imagery). Salt Lake County, Utah.  Latitude 40.614798°, Longitude -111.990941°, Retrieved October 6, 2022  or □ Other (Name & Date): Included in Wetland Delineation Report dated August 2022. □ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: An Approved Jurisdictional Determination (AJD) was verified on July 27, 2012, and evaluated under the same SPK number as the current request (SPK-2012-00518). In 2012, Salt Lake City Department of Airports submitted a request for an AJD verification within an 8.08-acre site that included a tributary to Barneys Creek and a stormwater ditch located on the northern side of the airport facility. On July 27, 2012, the U.S. Army Corporation (USACE) verified that the 8.08-acres study area did not support any jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. and a Department of the Army would not be required for any work within the 8.08-acre study area.
A verification of the presence of absence of waters of the U.S. for areas adjacent to the 8.08-acres site that were also within the airport facility was not requested in 2012. The current request expanded the study area from 8.08 acres to 849 acres to include the entire airport facility (including runaway protection zones), the Utah Army National Guard Facility, and the West Jordan Soccer Complex. The study area is depicted in the attached "Features of South Valley Regional Airport Study Area and Vicinity" map (AJD Form Attachment A).
<ul> <li>□ Applicable/supporting case law:</li> <li>□ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:</li> <li>□ Other information (please specify):</li> </ul>

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** In the 2012 AJD, the northern ditch was determined to be a stormwater linear feature that was excvated in uplands to convey stormwater from upland areas that were developed to the west of the airpot facility. This stromwater ditch did not appear on the 1951 USGS map or in aerial photos from that time period. A review of aerial photographs done for the current AJD revealed that the nothern ditch was filled between 2012 and 2013.

The 2012 AJD aslo evaluted a tributary to Barneys Creek consisting of a large vegetated swale with no OHWM or bed and bank characteristics. The tributary was located just north of where 7800 South is currently located. The tributary was vegetated with upland species with no regular flows and caputred stormwater from upland areas to the west of the airport facility. The mainstem channel of Barneys Creek entered the airport facility runway protection zone from the west and crossed 7800 South near the middle of the southern end of the airport facility. The confluence of the tributary and Barneys Creek (i.e. mainstem channel) was near the western side of the water tanks and detention basin located on the southeast corner of the airport property. Prior to 2009, the tributary discharged into the detention basin with no outlet. The tributary and Barneys Creek have been diverted into culverts under most of the study area and its immediate vicinity, particularly downstream (east) of the study area. The stream channel is open through the detention basin at the southeast corner of the airport property, but it was channelized into a straight, concrete-lined ditch between 2009 and 2010 and connected to the municipal irrigation or stormwater system on the downstream end.

Based on information in the AR report, hydrophytic plant species within the study area were located adjacent to the concretelined section of Barneys Creek witihn the detention basin. A lack of indicators of hydric conditions in the soils sampled from this area indicate that the periodic inundation from Barneys Creek is not adequate in frequency or duration to induce and maintain hydric soil conditions; therefore, this area failed the three-factor wetland test.

Several ditches have been constructed through upland areas within the airport property that are intended to accumulate runoff from the impervious surfaces of the airport during precipitation events and convey flows into the municipal stormwater system. All of these ditches are fully vegetated with upland plant species and lack any OHWM characteristics. In addition, a stormwater ditch was identified south of 7800 South. The stormwater ditch was excavated through upland areas and originates and ends at drains to the municipal stormwater system. This ditch is also vegetated with primarily upland plant species, lacks any characteristics of an OHWM, and do not appear to convey flows with any frequency. These ditches are not specifically depicted on the plans since they are stormwater features and lack an OHWM.