

**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):**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: MVN 2013-02732-SQ**

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: LA County/parish/borough: Iberville Parish City:  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 30.315062° **N**, Long. 91.261956° **W**.  
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: unnamed conveyances/

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Bayou Choctaw/ICWW

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 8070300

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: March 13, 2014

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** "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: 33,530 linear feet: width (ft) 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):<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: .

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: 4000 acres

Drainage area: 792 square miles

Average annual rainfall: 60+ inches

Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 2-5 river miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.

Project waters are 2-5 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: no.

Identify flow route to TNW<sup>5</sup>: unnamed conveyances to Wilbert's Canal to ICWW/Bayou Choctaw.

Tributary stream order, if known: 1 and 2.

<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>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.

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

**Tributary is:**  Natural  
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: Drainage canals for agriculture, etc.  
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

**Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):**

Average width: 10 feet  
Average depth: 2 feet  
Average side slopes: **2:1**.

**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: Maintained, vegetated banks, stable.

**Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes.** Explain: no.

**Tributary geometry:** **Relatively straight**

**Tributary gradient (approximate average slope):** 1-2 %

(c) Flow:

**Tributary provides for:** **Seasonal flow**

**Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year:** **20 (or greater)**

**Describe flow regime:** storm runoff during drier periods with negligible flow between events.

**Groundwater/stormwater combined during wetter periods of saturation and high water table.**

**Other information on duration and volume:** Increased flow, decreased duration due to ag conveyances.

**Surface flow is:** **Discrete and confined.** **Characteristics:** Usually flows within banks, remaining inundated during seasonal rainy, saturated periods.

**Subsurface flow:** **Pick List.** Explain findings: not measured.

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: not observed in field.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: typical agriculture, fertilizers, pesticides, clay, silts.

<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: crustaceans, mosquitofish, wading birds, reptiles.

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: .

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: .

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: .

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 buffer. 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: **30 (or more)**

Approximately ( 0 ) 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:Conveyances in the project area have replaced the natural drainage of the area and concentrated flow into channels to drain ag fields more quickly. Accelerated drainage has increased flow rates and decreased duration during relatively dry periods; however, conveyances stay inundated seasonally during rainy periods of saturation and high water table. Flow is very sluggish during periods of high water downstream. Conveyances on the property empty immediately into Wilberts Canal, an RPW that is a TNW in its lower reaches as it flows toward the GIWW/Bayou Choctaw. These tributary conveyances in agricultural areas are known to carry silt and clay sediments and organic material from the fields in addition to nutrients and pesticide residues. Given the limited assimilative capacities within these conveyances, the pollutants would readily stay suspended in the water column throughout the conveyance system on the property and into Wilberts Canal. This RPW would, in turn, deliver sediments, organic matter, pesticide residue, and nutrients directly to the GIWW/Bayou Choctaw, a TNW. Given the agricultural nature of most of the watershed, the significant impact to the downstream TNW would be negative, for the most part. The enhanced drainage features and loss of much of the natural floodwater storage capacity in the overall watershed allow floodwaters to reach the downstream system faster than the natural condition. Flow from this watershed in combination with many other similar watersheds in the region, will exceed the downstream storage capacity. The contributions of wetlands and upstream waters to the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of downstream waters is well documented in the literature (see references below). Conversely, the removal of natural wetlands and other floodplain functions from the system that result from conversion to agriculture has significant deleterious effects on the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the downstream systems. While organic matter and other inputs from the watershed may in part support downstream biota, it is more likely that excessive nutrients and BOD from organic matter will stress the downstream aquatic ecosystems.
- 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 width (ft), 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: Conveyances nearest to Wilberts Canal are inundated seasonally during rainy periods when the ground is saturated and the water table is above the channel bottoms.

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

- Tributary waters: **xxx** 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: **xxx** 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 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: 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>**

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

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

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: .
- 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): .

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: .

<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.

- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Addis, LA and Plaquemine, LA.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
- 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): 1998 IR, 2004 IR, 2008 IR, 2010 IR, 2013 true color.  
or  Other (Name & Date): LIDAR.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): USDA NRCS National Water and Climate Center Web Page.

Alexander, R.B., E.W. Boyer, R.A. Smith, G.E. Schwartz, and R.B. Moore, 2007. The Role of Headwater Streams in Downstream Water Quality. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 43. DOI: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00005.x.

Kappiella, Karen, and Lisa Fraley-McNeat. 2007. The Importance of Protecting Vulnerable Streams and Wetlands at the Local Level. *Wetlands and Watersheds Article #6*. Center for Watershed Protection. Elliot City, Maryland, for Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds. U.S. Environmental Protection, Washington, D.C.

Meyer, Judy et al. 2003. Where Rivers are Born: The Scientific Imperative for Defending Small Streams and Wetlands. *Sierra Club*.

Mitsch, W.J., J.W. Day Jr, J.W. Gilliam, P.M. Groffman, D.L. Hey, G.W. Randall, and N. Wang, 2001. Reducing Nitrogen Loading to the Gulf of Mexico From the Mississippi River Basin: Strategies to Counter a Persistent Ecological Problem. *Bioscience* 51:373-388.

North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2006. The Ecological and Water Quality Value of Headwater Wetlands in North Carolina. North Carolina Division of Water Quality. Raleigh, North Carolina.

Saksa, Philip; Xu, Yi Jun; Stich, Richard Date: 2013 Hydrologic influence on sediment transport of low-gradient, forested headwater streams in central Louisiana In: Guldin, James M., ed. 2013. Proceedings of the 15th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. e-Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-GTR-175. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 551-558. Station ID: Paper (invited, offered, keynote)-SRS-175

Tracie-Lynn Nadeau & Mark Cable Rains, Hydrological Connectivity Between Headwater Streams and Downstream Waters: How Science Can Inform Policy, 43(1) *J. AM. WATER RESOURCES ASS'N* 118-133 (2007)

Wipfli, M.S., J.S. Richardson, and R.J. Naiman, 2007. Ecological Linkages Between Headwaters and Downstream Ecosystems: Transport of Organic Matter, Invertebrates, and Wood Down Headwater Channels. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 43, DOI: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00007.x.

Zimmerman, R.J. and J.M. Nance, 2001. Effects of Hypoxia on the Shrimp Fishery of Louisiana and Texas. *Coastal and Estuarine Sciences* 58:293-310

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** Conveyances in the project area have replaced the natural drainage of the area and concentrated flow into channels to drain ag fields more quickly. Accelerated drainage has increased flow rates and decreased duration during relatively dry periods; however, conveyances stay inundated seasonally during rainy periods of saturation and high water table. Flow is very sluggish during periods of high water downstream. Conveyances on the property empty immediately into Wilberts Canal, an RPW that is a TNW in its lower reaches as it flows toward the GIWW/Bayou Choctaw. Given the limited assimilative capacities of the conveyances in an agricultural setting, this system of conveyances will have a significant negative impact on the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the downstream TNW.