



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): 4 May 2018**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Jacksonville District, SAJ-2001-00201; North St. Johns Commerce Center

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** The total acreage is approximately ± acres.

State: Florida County/parish/borough: St. Johns City: St. Augustine  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Latitude 30.068425°, Longitude -81.495363°  
Name of nearest waterbody: Sampson Creek  
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Sampson Creek

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 030801031301 – Durbin Creek

- 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:
- Field Determination. Date(s): 18 April 2018

**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):<sup>1</sup>**

- 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: width (ft) and/or acres.  
Wetlands: +/- 4.59 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):<sup>3</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.  
Explain: .

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

<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>3</sup> 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: **Sampson Creek**

Summarize rationale supporting determination: The section of Sampson Creek adjacent to the project site is defined as a TNW as this creek section is "navigable-in-fact"; and, likely was utilized historically for commerce and trade.

##### 2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent": Wetland 1(NW Wetland) is considered adjacent to (bordering) Sampson Creek as Interstate 95 forms a single man-made separation between Wetland 1 and Sampson Creek to the west. Based on an investigation of aerial photographs, Wetland 2 (NE Wetland) extends offsite to the north and continues north as a single wetland system that traverses northwest under I-95 and eventually abuts (connects to) Sampson Creek.

#### 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: **acres**

Drainage area: **acres**

Average annual rainfall: inches

Average annual snowfall: 0 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: .

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

Identify flow route to TNW<sup>5</sup>: The RPW flows southwest, then west, then northwest and directly into St. Johns River.  
Tributary stream order, if known: .

(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: 25 feet  
Average depth: 1-2 feet  
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

**Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):**

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

**Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain:** stable.

**Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:** na.

**Tributary geometry:** **Pick List**

**Tributary gradient (approximate average slope):** 1 %

(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  
 OHWM<sup>6</sup> (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):  
 Discontinuous OHWM.<sup>7</sup> 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: Water is tannic.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: None known.

<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.

<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>7</sup>Ibid.

(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: RPW supports typical aquatic wildlife.

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: forested and herbaceous.
- Wetland quality. Explain: low to moderate. .

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: on-site ditches.
  - 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: wetlands are low areas scattered through the pasture. They likely receive overland flow directly from the pasture, which is used for grazing cattle.

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: Varies from herbaceous to forested.
- 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: RPW appears to convey water from offsite to the north and southward offsite. .

### 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± acres.  
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: 4.59 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: Water levels during site visits were low or absent in portions of the wetland, however, evidence of higher water levels were observed in other areas. Water levels appear to depend on seasonal rainfall .

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

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

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

**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: +/- **4.59** 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.<sup>9</sup>**

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):<sup>10</sup>**

- 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: See Section B2.
- 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.

**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): \_\_\_\_\_.

<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.

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:
- 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) - Bak 1"=2,000', Durbin, FL.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey - USDA Soils Survey-St. Johns County, Florida
- National wetlands inventory map(s)
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s)
- FEMA/FIRM maps
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): Flagging Key Map, February 2018; Google Earth; Florida DOQQ/NAIP Aerials  
or  Other (Name & Date):
- Previous determination(s):
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** The extent of wetlands on-site were delineated pursuant to the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual.



**Project Boundary**

0 1,000 2,000  
Feet

Source(s): USGS Topographic Survey, Durbin, FL. Quadrangle (1992). USGS The National Map

Disclaimer: The information depicted on this figure is for conceptual purposes only, serves to aid a licensed engineer or geologist in rendering professional services, and is subject to review and approval by appropriate regulatory agencies.

USGS The National Map: National Boundaries Dataset, National Elevation Dataset, Geographic Names Information System, National Hydrography Dataset, National Land Cover Database, National Structures Dataset, and National Transportation Dataset; U.S. Census Bureau - TIGER/Line; HERE Road Data


**ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.**  
7220 Financial Way, Suite 100  
Jacksonville, Florida 32256  
(904) 470-2200  
(904) 470-2112 Fax  
[www.environmentalservicesinc.com](http://www.environmentalservicesinc.com)

Project Location

# CR210 & I-95


St. Johns County, Florida

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| Project:     | EJ14362.03 |
| Date:        | Feb 2018   |
| Drawn By:    | AA         |
| Checked By:  | JRN        |
| Approved By: | PCP        |
| Figure:      | 1          |




Google earth

Earth Point  
1 mi



- Project Boundary (23.79 ac.±)
- 8, Zolfo Fine Sand
- 11, Smyrna Fine Sand
- 34, Toco Fine Sand
- 44, Sparr Fine Sand; 0 To 5 Percent Slopes
- 53, Immokalee-uRban Land Complex
- 69, Bakersville Muck



Source(s): USDA Soils Survey of St. Johns County. ESRI World Imagery Basemap

Disclaimer: The information depicted on this figure is for conceptual purposes only, serves to aid a licensed engineer or geologist in rendering professional services, and is subject to review and approval by appropriate regulatory agencies.

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



**ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.**

7220 Financial Way, Suite 100  
Jacksonville, Florida 32256  
(904) 470-2200  
(904) 470-2112 Fax

[www.environmentalservicesinc.com](http://www.environmentalservicesinc.com)


NRCS Soils

## CR210 & I-95

St. Johns County, Florida

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| Project:     | EJ14362.03 |
| Date:        | Feb 2018   |
| Drawn By:    | AA         |
| Checked By:  | JRN        |
| Approved By: | PCP        |
| Figure:      | 2          |

Hydric Rating by Map Unit—St. Johns County, Florida



## MAP LEGEND

### Area of Interest (AOI)

 Area of Interest (AOI)

### Soils

#### Soil Rating Polygons

-  Hydric (100%)
-  Hydric (66 to 99%)
-  Hydric (33 to 65%)
-  Hydric (1 to 32%)
-  Not Hydric (0%)
-  Not rated or not available

#### Soil Rating Lines

-  Hydric (100%)
-  Hydric (66 to 99%)
-  Hydric (33 to 65%)
-  Hydric (1 to 32%)
-  Not Hydric (0%)
-  Not rated or not available

#### Soil Rating Points

-  Hydric (100%)
-  Hydric (66 to 99%)
-  Hydric (33 to 65%)
-  Hydric (1 to 32%)
-  Not Hydric (0%)
-  Not rated or not available

### Water Features

 Streams and Canals

### Transportation

-  Rails
-  Interstate Highways
-  US Routes
-  Major Roads
-  Local Roads

### Background

 Aerial Photography

## MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:20,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service  
 Web Soil Survey URL:  
 Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: St. Johns County, Florida  
 Survey Area Data: Version 16, Oct 6, 2017


Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Dec 31, 2009—Apr 5, 2017

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

## Hydric Rating by Map Unit

| Map unit symbol                    | Map unit name  | Rating | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
|------------------------------------|--|--------|--------------|----------------|
| 8                                  | Zolfo fine sand                                      | 0      | 13.8         | 53.0%          |
| 11                                 | Smyrna-Smyrna, wet, fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 23     | 6.8          | 26.1%          |
| 34                                 | Tocoi fine sand                                      | 29     | 0.6          | 2.4%           |
| 44                                 | Sparr fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes               | 0      | 0.6          | 2.3%           |
| 53                                 | Immokalee-Urban land complex                         | 5      | 1.7          | 6.4%           |
| 69                                 | Bakersville muck                                     | 100    | 2.5          | 9.8%           |
| <b>Totals for Area of Interest</b> |  |        | <b>26.0</b>  | <b>100.0%</b>  |



**Project Boundary (23.79 ac.±)**

**Wetlands (4.59 ac.±)**

**Uplands (19.20 ac.±)**

○ Wetland Flags

● Upland Data Points

0 100 200  
Feet

Source(s): ESRI World Imagery Basemap

Disclaimer: The information depicted on this figure is for conceptual purposes only, serves to aid a licensed engineer or geologist in rendering professional services, and is subject to review and approval by appropriate regulatory agencies.

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



**ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.**

7220 Financial Way, Suite 100  
Jacksonville, Florida 32256  
(904) 470-2200  
(904) 470-2112 Fax


[www.environmentalservicesinc.com](http://www.environmentalservicesinc.com)

Flagging Key Map

**CR210 & I-95**

St. Johns County, Florida

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| Project:     | EJ14362.03 |
| Date:        | Feb 2018   |
| Drawn By:    | AA         |
| Checked By:  | JRN        |
| Approved By: | PCP        |
| Figure:      | 3          |



ST. JOHNS RIVER

JULINGTON CREEK

DURBIN CREEK

SAMPSON CREEK

Phillips Hwy  
9B

210

Old Palm Valley Rd

A1A

Ponte Vedra Blvd

5

95

Dixie Hwy

13

16A

16


Shands Bridge

Google earth

Image © 2018 TerraMetrics  
© 2018 Google

5 mi





SAMPSON  
CREEK

SITE


CR-210

I-95

Google earth



1 mi



SAMPSON  
CREEK

SITE

Google earth

700 ft



IR 1994 -Google Earth



SAMPSON  
CREEK

SITE

Google earth



1000 ft

IR 1999 -Google Earth



SAMPSON  
CREEK

SITE

Google earth



1000 ft

IR 2004 -Google Earth



Google earth




1000 ft

IR 2010 -Google Earth



Google earth





SAMPSON CREEK

SITE

SAMPSON CREEK

Google earth WITH NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY OVERLAY

4000 ft



**NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OPTIONS AND PROCESS AND  
REQUEST FOR APPEAL**

|                                     |  |                   |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Applicant: Allen Land Group, Inc.   | File Number: SAJ-2001-00201  | Date: May 4, 2018 |
| Attached is:                        |  | See Section below |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission) | A                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission)         | B                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | PERMIT DENIAL  | C                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION                              | D                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION                           | E                 |

SECTION I - The following identifies your rights and options regarding an administrative appeal of the above decision. Additional information may be found at [http://www.usace.army.mil/CECW/Pages/reg\\_materials.aspx](http://www.usace.army.mil/CECW/Pages/reg_materials.aspx) or Corps regulations at 33 CFR Part 331.

A: INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT: You may accept or object to the permit.

- **ACCEPT:** *If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the district engineer for final authorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work is authorized. Your signature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations associated with the permit.*
- **OBJECT:** If you object to the permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions therein, you may request that the permit be modified accordingly. You must complete Section II of this form and return the form to the district engineer. Your objections must be received by the district engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice, or you will forfeit your right to appeal the permit in the future. Upon receipt of your letter, the district engineer will evaluate your objections and may: (a) modify the permit to address all of your concerns, (b) modify the permit to address some of your objections, or (c) not modify the permit having determined that the permit should be issued as previously written. After evaluating your objections, the district engineer will send you a proffered permit for your reconsideration, as indicated in Section B below.

B: PROFFERED PERMIT: You may accept or appeal the permit

- **ACCEPT:** *If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the district engineer for final authorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work is authorized. Your signature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations associated with the permit.*
- **APPEAL:** If you choose to decline the proffered permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions therein, you may appeal the declined permit under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

C: PERMIT DENIAL: You may appeal the denial of a permit under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

D: APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You may accept or appeal the approved JD or provide new information.

- **ACCEPT:** *You do not need to notify the Corps to accept an approved JD. Failure to notify the Corps within 60 days of the date of this notice, means that you accept the approved JD in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the approved JD.*
- **APPEAL:** If you disagree with the approved JD, you may appeal the approved JD under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

E: PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You do not need to respond to the Corps regarding the preliminary JD. The Preliminary JD is not appealable. If you wish, you may request an approved JD (which may be appealed), by contacting the Corps district for further instruction. Also you may provide new information for further consideration by the Corps to reevaluate the JD.

**SECTION II - REQUEST FOR APPEAL or OBJECTIONS TO AN INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT**

**REASONS FOR APPEAL OR OBJECTIONS:** (Describe your reasons for appealing the decision or your objections to an initial proffered permit in clear concise statements. You may attach additional information to this form to clarify where your reasons or objections are addressed in the administrative record.)

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** The appeal is limited to a review of the administrative record, the Corps memorandum for the record of the appeal conference or meeting, and any supplemental information that the review officer has determined is needed to clarify the administrative record. Neither the appellant nor the Corps may add new information or analyses to the record. However, you may provide additional information to clarify the location of information that is already in the administrative record.

**POINT OF CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS OR INFORMATION:**

If you have questions regarding this decision you may contact:

**Project Manager as noted in letter**

If you have questions regarding the appeal process you may contact:

Jason W. Steele  
Administrative Appeals Review Officer  
USACE – South Atlantic Division  
60 Forsyth Street SW, Room 10M15  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8801  
(404) 562-5137

**RIGHT OF ENTRY:** Your signature below grants the right of entry to Corps of Engineers personnel, and any government consultants, to conduct investigations of the project site during the course of the appeal process. You will be provided a 15 day notice of any site investigation, and will have the opportunity to participate in all site investigations.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of appellant or agent.

Date:

Telephone number: