



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

**DRY LAND APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM¹
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): October 26, 2018

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: SAJ-RD-SP; Chick-fil-a Jurisdictional Determination;SAJ-2018-00216 (JD-RHF)

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Florida County/parish/borough: St. Lucie County City: Port St. Lucie
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 27.313880 °, Long. -80.397109 °
Universal Transverse Mercator: 17

Name of nearest waterbody: Storm water retention pond

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 030902060200 North Fork of the St. Lucie River

- Check if map/diagram of review area is 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: May 11, 2018
 Field Determination. Date(s): May 10, 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.

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.

SECTION III: 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: [Click here to enter text.](#)
 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: One data point collected at the site visit conducted on 5/10/18
 U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: 030902060200 North Fork of the St. Lucie River
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: [Click here to enter text.](#)
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Map Unit 26 Oldsmar Sand, depressional & 31 Pepper and EauGalie sands
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Palustrine Emergent: Persistent
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): [Click here to enter text.](#)
 FEMA/FIRM maps: [Click here to enter text.](#)
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: [Click here to enter text.](#) (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth 3/21/17
 or Other (Name & Date): [Click here to enter text.](#)
 Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: [Click here to enter text.](#)
 Applicable/supporting case law: [Click here to enter text.](#)

¹ This form is for use only in recording approved JDs involving dry land. It extracts the relevant elements of the longer approved JD form in use since 2007 for aquatic areas and adds no new fields.

- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: [Click here to enter text.](#)
- Other information (please specify): Site visit conducted on 10 May 2018.

B. REQUIRED ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD. EXPLAIN RATIONALE FOR DETERMINATION THAT THE REVIEW AREA ONLY INCLUDES DRY LAND: A site visit was conducted on 10 May 2018. The subject property is within an existing mixed use development. The general landform was convex or linear with one depressional, forested area. A majority of the property consisted of non-hydric soils, an absence of hydrology, and mowed herbaceous groundcover. The data point was collected within the depressional area of the property and it was determined there were no indicators of hydrology, hydrophytic vegetation, or hydric soils present. Additionally, aerial imagery indicates the project area has been extensively modified prior to 1994. Based on this evidence, it was determined that there were no wetlands present and that the entire review area consisted of uplands.