

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): September 3, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Walla Walla District, Whitetail Planned Unit Development, NW-1994-0202770

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Area 1 was previously delineated in 1996 by Toothman Orton Engineering. Minor changes were documented to have occurred from 1996 to present in the most recent delineation performed in 2017 by Crestline Engineering, Inc. Area changes in open water from expansion activities of Douglas Pond in 2005, and subsequent establishment of emergent wetlands along the pond fringes within the pond expansion area were the notable differences from the original delineation performed in 1996. The expansion of Douglas Pond was to the north of Whitetail Road/Boydston Road Intersection. Refer to yellow highlighted area. The original delineation was performed for the development of an 18-hole golf course, associated with the original development in 1996. In 2005, additional improvements to the golf course were made, which included the expansion of the Douglas Pond, as well as construction of adjacent vacation homes. Sesech Engineering performed a 2nd wetland delineation in April of 2005. The 2017 wetland delineation is the 3rd wetland delineation within the project area. Flows are considered perennial from the outlet control structures of Douglas Pond in the unnamed waterway, which flows into Rio Vista Pond. Rio Vista Pond has a concrete control outlet, which outflow stream channel is considered perennial, which flows into the North Fork Payette River.

State: Idaho County/parish/borough: Valley City: McCall
 Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): 44.9141° Lat. -116.1250° Long.
 Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 11 Northing 568124 N, Easting 4973521 E.

Name of nearest waterbody: unnamed trib. to the North Fork Payette River
 Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Snake River
 Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 17050123
 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: September 1, 2017
- Field Determination. Date(s): June 1, 2017

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 "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 1 acres.
 Wetlands: 3.12 acres.

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).

- c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual
Elevation of established OHWM (if known): N/A.
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: .

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 *Kapanos* 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: square miles
 Drainage area: acres
 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.

Pick List river miles from TNW.
 Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.

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

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: 1.

⁴ Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the and 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):

- 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):

- Silts
- Sands
- Cobbles
- Bedrock
- Other. Explain:
- Vegetation. Type/% cover:
- Concrete
- Muck

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):

Bed and banks

OHWM⁶ (check all indicators that apply):

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- changes in the character of soil
- shelving
- vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
- leaf litter disturbed or washed away
- sediment deposition
- water staining
- other (list):

Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain:

- abrupt change in plant community
- multiple observed or predicted flow events
- scour
- sediment sorting
- the presence of wrack line
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- the presence of litter and debris

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
- fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
- physical markings/characteristics
- physical markings;
- survey to available datum;
- vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
- 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.

2. Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

- (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:

(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:

- (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 corridor. 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: **2**
 Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

tributary is perennial. The unnamed stream originates to the northwest of the project site and flows in a southeasterly direction through the project area. The unnamed stream was determined to be intermittent and drive by snow melt and to some extent ground water. A small inchannel pond was present in 1997. In 2000, the USACE issued a Standard Permit to excavate and fill in portions of the original intermittent stream channel and expansion of the pond (Douglas Pond), for a planned 18-hole golf course. Construction of the pond transformed the unnamed intermittent channel to a perennial stream downstream of the pond. The pond was later expanded again in 2005 and, the Corps issued a modification to the original permit authorization.

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

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.

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

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 about 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:

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

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of 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), 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), 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 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), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWS, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the *Kapnos* Guidance and discussed in the *Instructional Guidebook*. Factors to consider include, for example:

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.

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

)
)

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

For each wetland, specify the following:

- 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:
- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
 - Other non-wetland waters: 1 acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: **Open Water.**
- Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
 - Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters:
3. **Non-RPWS* 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 abutting an 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 within Area 1 were originally delineated in 1996 and determined to be subject to jurisdiction. The site was re-verified in 2005 and again more recently in 2017. The Corps conducted an on-site on June 1, 2017 and re-confirmed the wetlands directly about the unnamed stream and in channel pond. Wetland sites are indicated in the JD attachments and are as described as: Site IA {PEM} 0.69 acres; Site IB {PSS} at 0.08 acres; Site IC {PSS} 0.01 acres; Site ID {PSS} 0.03; Site IE{PEM} at 0.03; and, Site IF{PSS}2.28 acres.**
- 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: **3.12 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.***
 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.
- Wetlands: acres.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements.
- Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.
- Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR).
- Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain:
- Other: (explain, if not covered above):

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

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

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

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

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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: Whitetail Planned Unit Development, Wetland Delineation, June 2017.
- 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: 17050123.
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: 7.5 Minute Quad Map, Meadows.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Valley Area, Idaho, Parts of Adams and Valley Counties, 2006.

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.

- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth, July 27, 2013 and prior historical aerial photographs.
- or Other (Name & Date):
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: April 18, 2005 Wetland Delineation prepared by Sesech Engineering Company; and an October 3, 1996 Wetland Delineation prepared by Toothman-Orton Engineering Company.
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify): Corps of Engineers Regional Supplement, Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region, Version 2.0, May 2010.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Wetland Delineation illustrations of Wetland Area 1 from: Whitetail Planned Unit Development, Wetland Delineation Supplement, dated June 2017, prepared by Crestline Engineers, Inc. The re-delineation of the wetland in Area 1 confirmed the wetland had greater than 50 percent wetland plants, had a hydric soil and had a ground water table within 12 inches of the surface during the spring of the year. The on-site conducted by the Corps confirmed the wetlands are directly abutting the unnamed stream and the stream has a direct connection to another waters of the United States. Based on the above the unnamed stream and adjacent wetlands are subject to regulation pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in accordance with 33 CFR Part 328.3 (a) (5) and (7)..