



**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
REGULATORY PROGRAM
APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM (INTERIM)
NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE**

I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Completion Date of Approved Jurisdictional Determination (AJD): 9/11/2020
 ORM Number: NAO-2020-01622
 Associated JDs: N/A
 Review Area Location¹: State/Territory: VA City: Alexandria County/Parish/Borough: Fairfax
 Center Coordinates of Review Area: Latitude 38.69833 Longitude -77.10111

II. FINDINGS

A. Summary: Check all that apply. At least one box from the following list MUST be selected. Complete the corresponding sections/tables and summarize data sources.

- The review area is comprised entirely of dry land (i.e., there are no waters or water features, including wetlands, of any kind in the entire review area). Rationale: N/A or describe rationale.
- There are “navigable waters of the United States” within Rivers and Harbors Act jurisdiction within the review area (complete table in Section II.B).
- There are “waters of the United States” within Clean Water Act jurisdiction within the review area (complete appropriate tables in Section II.C).
- There are waters or water features excluded from Clean Water Act jurisdiction within the review area (complete table in Section II.D).

B. Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 Section 10 (§ 10)²

§ 10 Name	§ 10 Size	§ 10 Criteria	Rationale for § 10 Determination
N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.

C. Clean Water Act Section 404

Territorial Seas and Traditional Navigable Waters ((a)(1) waters): ³			
(a)(1) Name	(a)(1) Size	(a)(1) Criteria	Rationale for (a)(1) Determination
Potomac River	364 linear feet	(a)(1) Water is also subject to Sections 9 or 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act - RHA Tidal water is subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.	Traditionally Navigable Water – Tidal Potomac River, subject to the ebb and flow of tide

Tributaries ((a)(2) waters):			
(a)(2) Name	(a)(2) Size	(a)(2) Criteria	Rationale for (a)(2) Determination
N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.

¹ Map(s)/figure(s) are attached to the AJD provided to the requestor.

² If the navigable water is not subject to the ebb and flow of the tide or included on the District’s list of Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 navigable waters list, do NOT use this document to make the determination. The District must continue to follow the procedure outlined in 33 CFR part 329.14 to make a Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 navigability determination.

³ A stand-alone TNW determination is completed independently of a request for an AJD. A stand-alone TNW determination is conducted for a specific segment of river or stream or other type of waterbody, such as a lake, where upstream or downstream limits or lake borders are established. A stand-alone TNW determination should be completed following applicable guidance and should NOT be documented on the AJD Form.



**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
REGULATORY PROGRAM
APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM (INTERIM)
NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE**

Lakes and ponds, and impoundments of jurisdictional waters ((a)(3) waters):				
(a)(3) Name	(a)(3) Size	(a)(3) Criteria	Rationale for (a)(3) Determination	
N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	

Adjacent wetlands ((a)(4) waters):				
(a)(4) Name	(a)(4) Size	(a)(4) Criteria	Rationale for (a)(4) Determination	
N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	

D. Excluded Waters or Features

Excluded waters ((b)(1) – (b)(12)): ⁴				
Exclusion Name	Exclusion Size	Exclusion ⁵	Rationale for Exclusion Determination	
N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	N/A.	

III. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

A. Select/enter all resources that were used to aid in this determination and attach data/maps to this document and/or references/citations in the administrative record, as appropriate.

Information submitted by, or on behalf of, the applicant/consultant: [Attachment I: Waters of the U.S. \(Including Wetlands\) Delineation and Resource Protection Area Evaluation, Jesson Belle Rive Property, August 25, 2020](#)

This information **Select.** sufficient for purposes of this AJD.

Rationale: [N/A or describe rationale for insufficiency \(including partial insufficiency\).](#)

Data sheets prepared by the Corps: [Title\(s\) and/or date\(s\).](#)

Photographs: [Aerial and Other: 1954 Black and White Imagery from Fairfax County GIS and Mapping Services, Spring 2017 Near Color Infrared Imagery from Virginia Base Mapping Program, Spring 2019 Natural Color Imagery from Fairfax County Digital Data, and site photographs from August 17, 2020.](#)

Corps site visit(s) conducted on: [Date\(s\).](#)

Previous Jurisdictional Determinations (AJDs or PJDs): [ORM Number\(s\) and date\(s\).](#)

Antecedent Precipitation Tool: [provide detailed discussion in Section III.B.](#)

USDA NRCS Soil Survey: [Fairfax County Digital Data, 2018](#)

USFWS NWI maps: [Digital NWI Map, March 2019](#)

USGS topographic maps: [Mount Vernon, MD VAV 1983](#)

Other data sources used to aid in this determination:

Data Source (select)	Name and/or date and other relevant information
USGS Sources	N/A.
USDA Sources	N/A.
NOAA Sources	MLW and MHW elevations obtained from NOAA VDATUM Software – see Attachment I.
USACE Sources	N/A.
State/Local/Tribal Sources	N/A.
Other Sources	N/A.

⁴ Some excluded waters, such as (b)(2) and (b)(4), may not be specifically identified on the AJD form unless a requestor specifically asks a Corps district to do so. Corps districts may, in case-by-case instances, choose to identify some or all of these waters within the review area.

⁵ Because of the broad nature of the (b)(1) exclusion and in an effort to collect data on specific types of waters that would be covered by the (b)(1) exclusion, four sub-categories of (b)(1) exclusions were administratively created for the purposes of the AJD Form. These four sub-categories are not new exclusions, but are simply administrative distinctions and remain (b)(1) exclusions as defined by the NWPR.



**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
REGULATORY PROGRAM
APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM (INTERIM)
NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE**

- B. Typical year assessment(s):** Based on the APT tool results, this area is experiencing wetter than normal conditions. Although conditions are wetter than normal, Data Point #1 lacked wetland hydrology; Data Point #2 included multiple indicators of wetland hydrology but did not include a direct observation of surface water or water table, thus supporting the decision that the wetter than normal conditions did not influence the hydrology determination at this data point.
- C. Additional comments to support AJD:** N/A or provide additional discussion as appropriate.