



Regulatory Program

INTERIM APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in the Interim Approved Jurisdictional Determination Form User Manual.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (AJD): 18-Oct-2019

B. ORM NUMBER IN APPROPRIATE FORMAT (e.g., HQ-2015-00001-SMJ): NAP-2009-00185-75

B. ONWINDINGER IN AFFRONTIATE FORWAT (E.g., 11Q-2013-00001-300). NAF-2003-00103-13
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State:New Jersey County/parish/borough: Atlantic City: Atlantic City
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 39.381294, Long74.425637.
Map(s)/diagram(s) of review area (including map identifying single point of entry (SPOE) watershed and/or potential
jurisdictional areas where applicable) is/are: 🛛 attached 🔲 in report/map titled
Other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc.) are associated with this action and are recorded on a
different jurisdictional determination (JD) form. List JD form ID numbers (e.g., HQ-2015-00001-SMJ-1):
D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:
Office (Desk) Determination Only. Date:
Office (Desk) and Field Determination. Office/Desk Dates: 04-Aug-2017, 20-Aug-2019, 09-Sep-2019, and
16-Oct-2019 Field Date(s): 18-Sep-2017, 27-Nov-2017, 27-Mar-2018, and 23-May-2019.
SECTION II: DATA SOURCES Charles III that were used to sid in the determination and attach data/many to this A ID form and/or references/sitation
Check all that were used to aid in the determination and attach data/maps to this AJD form and/or references/citations in the administrative record, as appropriate
in the administrative record, as appropriate.
Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Title/Date: "U.S.A.C.E.
WETLANDS PLAN of BLOCK 571, LOT 2 ATLANTIC CITY, ATLANTIC COUNTY, N.J.", sheet no. S-1 (1 of 1), scale:
1"=40', dated 8/29/2019, prepared by Paulus, Sokolowski and Sartor, LLC. and last revised 9/16/19.
Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
☐ Data sheets/delineation report are sufficient for purposes of AJD form. Title/Date: Letter from Mr. Brian
McPeake (PS&S) to Mr. Edward Bonner (USACE); regarding "CENAP-OP-R 2009-00185-75 (JD) 14-Acre Parcel
Block 571, Lot 2 Atlantic City, Atlantic County, New Jersey"; and dated September 16, 2019.
Data sheets/delineation report are not sufficient for purposes of AJD form. Summarize rationale and include
information on revised data sheets/delineation report that this AJD form has relied upon:
Revised Title/Date: .
Data sheets prepared by the Corps. Title/Date:
Corps navigable waters study. Title/Date:
CorpsMap ORM map layers. Title/Date:
USGS Hydrologic Atlas. Title/Date: .
USGS, NHD, or WBD data/maps. Title/Date: .
☐ USGS 8, 10 and/or 12 digit HUC maps. HUC number:
☐ USGS maps. Scale & quad name and date: .
☐ USDA NRCS Soil Survey. Citation: .
USFWS National Wetlands Inventory maps. Citation:
State/Local wetland inventory maps. Citation:
FEMA/FIRM maps. Citation:
Photographs: ☐ Aerial. Citation: . or ☐ Other. Citation: "Attachment C Updated Photo Log", photo no. 1
through 5 of 5, and taken on Sentember 11, 2019

Page 1 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

 ☑ Previous JDs. File no. and date of JD letter: NAP-2005-00072-35, dated May 5, 2005. ☑ Applicable/supporting case law: ☑ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: ☑ Other information (please specify): Letter from Walter Judge (PS&S) to Samuel Reynolds (USACE); regarding "Jurisdictional Application 14-Acre Parcel Block 571, Lot 2 Atlantic City, Atlantic County, New Jersey"; and dated June 9, 2017.
Field MFR; regarding site visit with agent on September 18, 2017; dated October 27, 2017.
Field MFR; regarding site visit with Surveillance and Enforcement Section, NJDEP, and agent on November 27, 2017 dated December 5, 2017.
Information Request Letter, dated December 22, 2017.
MFR; regarding site visit by Surveillance and Enforcement Section, dated March 27, 2018.
MFR; regarding office meeting on April 26, 2018, between requestor and their agents and this office; dated May 9, 2018.
Letter from Mr. Brian McPeake (PS&S) to Mr. Edward Bonner (USACE); regarding "CENAP-OP-R 2009-00185-75 (JD) 14-Acre Parcel Block 571, Lot 2 Atlantic City, Atlantic County, New Jersey"; and dated July 25, 2019.
Letter from Mr. Brian McPeake (PS&S) to Mr. Edward Bonner (USACE); regarding "CENAP-OP-R 2009-00185-75 (JD) 14-Acre Parcel Block 571, Lot 2 Atlantic City, Atlantic County, New Jersey"; and dated September 6, 2019.
SECTION III: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
Complete ORM "Aquatic Resource Upload Sheet" or Export and Print the Aquatic Resource Water Droplet Screen from ORM for All Waters and Features, Regardless of Jurisdictional Status – Required
A. RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT (RHA) SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION: "navigable waters of the U.S." within RHA jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.
• Complete Table 1 - Required NOTE: If the navigable water is not subject to the ebb and flow of the tide or included on the District's list of Section 10 navigable waters list, DO NOT USE THIS FORM TO MAKE THE DETERMINATION. The District must continue to follow the procedure outlined in 33 CFR part 329.14 to make a Section 10 RHA navigability determination. B. CLEAN WATER ACT (CWA) SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION: "waters of the U.S." within CWA jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328.3) in the review area. Check all that apply.

	wetlands, ponds, lakes, oxbows, impoundments, and similar waters.
	Complete Table 6 - Required
	Bordering/Contiguous.
	Neighboring:
	(c)(2)(i): All waters located within 100 feet of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of a water identified in
	paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(5) of 33 CFR part 328.3.
	(c)(2)(ii): All waters located within the 100-year floodplain of a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(5) of
	33 CFR part 328.3 and not more than 1,500 feet of the OHWM of such water.
	(c)(2)(iii): All waters located within 1,500 feet of the high tide line of a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1) or
_	(a)(3) of 33 CFR part 328.3, and all waters within 1,500 feet of the OHWM of the Great Lakes.
	(a)(7): All waters identified in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(7)(i)-(v) where they are determined, on a case-specific basis, to
	have a significant nexus to a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(3) of 33 CFR part 328.3.
	Complete Table 7 for the significant nexus determination. Attach a map delineating the SPOE watershed boundary with (a)(7) waters identified in the similarly situated analysis. Beguired.
	watershed boundary with (a)(7) waters identified in the similarly situated analysis Required Includes water(s) that are geographically and physically adjacent per (a)(6), but are being used for established
	normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities (33 USC Section 1344(f)(1)) and therefore are not adjacent
	and require a case-specific significant nexus determination.
	(a)(8): All waters located within the 100-year floodplain of a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(3) of 33
	CFR part 328.3 not covered by (c)(2)(ii) above and all waters located within 4,000 feet of the high tide line or
	OHWM of a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(5) of 33 CFR part 328.3 where they are determined on a
	case-specific basis to have a significant nexus to a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(3) of 33 CFR part
	328.3.
	Complete Table 8 for the significant nexus determination. Attach a map delineating the SPOE
	watershed boundary with (a)(8) waters identified in the similarly situated analysis Required
	Includes water(s) that are geographically and physically adjacent per (a)(6), but are being used for established
	normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities (33 USC Section 1344(f)(1)) and therefore are not adjacent
	and require a case-specific significant nexus determination.
<u>ე.</u>	NON-WATERS OF THE U.S. FINDINGS:
<u>Ch</u>	eck all that apply.
닉	The review area is comprised entirely of dry land.
	Potential-(a)(7) Waters: Waters that DO NOT have a significant nexus to a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-
	(a)(3) of 33 CFR part 328.3.
	Complete Table 9 and attach a map delineating the SPOE watershed boundary with potential (a)(7) waters identified in the similarly situated analysis. Beginned.
	(a)(7) waters identified in the similarly situated analysis Required
	Includes water(s) that are geographically and physically adjacent per (a)(6), but are being used for established
	normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities (33 USC Section 1344(f)(1)) and therefore are not adjacent
_	and require a case-specific significant nexus determination.
	Potential-(a)(8) Waters: Waters that DO NOT have a significant nexus to a water identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-
	(a)(3) of 33 CFR part 328.3.
	 Complete Table 9 and attach a map delineating the SPOE watershed boundary with potential (a)(8) waters identified in the similarly situated analysis Required
	Includes water(s) that are geographically and physically adjacent per (a)(6), but are being used for established
	normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities (33 USC Section 1344(f)(1)) and therefore are not adjacent
	and require a case-specific significant nexus determination.
∇	Excluded Waters (Non-Waters of U.S.), even where they otherwise meet the terms of paragraphs (a)(4)-(a)(8):
Δ	• Complete Table 10 - Required
	(b)(1): Waste treatment systems, including treatment ponds or lagoons designed to meet the requirements of
	the CWA.
	(b)(2): Prior converted cropland.
	(b)(3)(i): Ditches with ephemeral flow that are not a relocated tributary or excavated in a tributary.
	(b)(3)(ii): Ditches with intermittent flow that are not a relocated tributary, excavated in a tributary, or drain
	wetlands.
	(b)(3)(iii): Ditches that do not flow, either directly or through another water, into a water identified in
	paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(3).
	(b)(4)(i): Artificially irrigated areas that would revert to dry land should application of water to that area cease.
	I (b)(4)(ii); Artificial, constructed lakes and ponds created in dry land such as farm and stock watering ponds
	(b)(4)(ii): Artificial, constructed lakes and ponds created in dry land such as farm and stock watering ponds, irrigation ponds, settling basins, fields flooded for rice growing, log cleaning ponds, or cooling ponds.
	 (b)(4)(ii): Artificial, constructed lakes and ponds created in dry land such as farm and stock watering ponds, irrigation ponds, settling basins, fields flooded for rice growing, log cleaning ponds, or cooling ponds. (b)(4)(iii): Artificial reflecting pools or swimming pools created in dry land.¹

Page 3 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

(b)(4)(iv): Small ornamental waters created in dry land.
$\boxed{(b)(4)(v)}$: Water-filled depressions created in dry land incidental to mining or construction activity, including
pits excavated for obtaining fill, sand, or gravel that fill with water.
(b)(4)(vi): Erosional features, including gullies, rills, and other ephemeral features that do not meet the
definition of tributary, non-wetland swales, and lawfully constructed grassed waterways. ¹
(b)(4)(vii): Puddles. ¹
(b)(5): Groundwater, including groundwater drained through subsurface drainage systems.1
(b)(6): Stormwater control features constructed to convey, treat, or store stormwater that are created in dry
land. ¹
(b)(7): Wastewater recycling structures created in dry land; detention and retention basins built for wastewate
recycling; groundwater recharge basins; percolation ponds built for wastewater recycling; and water
distributary structures built for wastewater recycling.
Other non-jurisdictional waters/features within review area that do not meet the definitions in 33 CFR 328.3 of
(a)(1)-(a)(8) waters and are not excluded waters identified in (b)(1)-(b)(7).
Complete Table 11 - Required.

D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT AJD: Additional comments prepared by Todd Schaible.

On September 17, 2017, Todd Schaible met with Brian Kirkpatrick onsite to discuss the previous AJD; the concept of normal circumstances; RGL 16-01 Appendix 1 regarding JDs; the Memorandum of Agreement between the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) and Department of the Army regarding jurisdiction; and the concept of abandonment. After the discussion, Mssrs. Schaible and Kirkpatrick walked the site to observe the delineation. After walking the site, Mr. Kirkpatrick requested answers regarding wetlands incidental to construction activities and NJDEP lead responsibility on jurisdiction.

Following the initial site visit, on October 26, 2017, Todd Schaible met with Ed Bonner, Bill Jenkins, Mike Hayduk, and Kevin Maley to discuss the two issues that Mr. Kirkpatrick raised. After some discussion, Mr. Bonner agreed with the recommedation that the wetlands are waters of the United States and directed Mr. Schaible to complete the AJD.

On November 27, 2017, Todd Schaible met with Kevin Maley, Mike Reilly, Brett Kosowski, and Brian Kirkpatrick onsite to complete the AJD. Based on the hydrology, vegetation and soils observed in areas designated as uplands during site visits on September 18, 2017, and November 27, 2017, as well as presented with the information submitted on June 9, 2017, and February 4, 2009, this office could not verify the accuracy of the delineation at that time and recommended that the applicant perform additional wetland investigations for the entire site. These additional wetland investigations need to be based upon the procedures outlined in the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Regional Supplement.

On December 22, 2017, this office sent the agent an information request letter, noting that this office retains authority to independently or jointly establish jurisdictional boundaries; that surface water and groundwater oberservations were not fully representative of on-site hydrology conditions during the growing season; that the on-site wetlands are adjacent to the Absecon Inlet, per SWANCC and Rapanos guidance; that additional investigations are required to verify the limits of wetlands, per the Regional Supplement; and that the cessation of construction activities have led to the development of wetlands, and are waters of the United States. However, this final note was made in accordance with the 1986/1988 regulations, which allowed for wetlands incidental to construction activities to be considered waters of the United States on a case-by-case basis.

On March 27, 2018, Kevin Maley and Mike Reilly conducted a site visit to determine if the wetlands had a hydrologic connection to the Absecon Inlet. Mr. Maley observed a direct ponded and/or saturated connection from the site to the inlet, as well as where wetlands connected across the dirt road.

On April 26, 2018, Ed Bonner, Amanda Phily, and Todd Schaible met with the JD requestor and their agents in the Philadelphia District Office to discuss the subject JD request. Mr. Ballance stated that the property owner had revised the development plan from a parking lot for displaced casino employees to a residential development. Mr. Schaible recommended that the agent continue to monitor hydrology throughout the year to accurately delineate the wetlands onsite. Mr. McPeake asked if this office has verified JDs for similar sites. Mr. Bonner responded that we would check our files for similar JDs and that the agent should investigate both off- and on-site drainage to and from the site. A list

Page 4 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

¹ In many cases these excluded features will not be specifically identified on the AJD form, unless specifically requested. Corps Districts may, in case-by-case instances, choose to identify some or all of these features within the review area.

of similar JDs with notes on whether or not the aquatic resources were considered jurisdictional was sent to the JD requestor and their agents on May 23, 2018.

On August 16, 2018, this office withdrew the AJD in ORM2, which was being evaluated under the 1986/1988 regulations with SWANNC and Rapanos guidance, and opened a new AJD in ORM2 in compliance with the court decision to evaluate the request under the 2015 Clean Water Rule.

On May 23, 2019, Ed Bonner and Todd Schaible met with the JD requestor and their agents onsite to further assess conditions at MGM's property and to discuss potential off-site drainage improvements to divert surface water runoff away from the subject property. After a brief discussion along the shoreline, the attendees walked the perimeter of the site counter clockwise, taking note of the lack of drainage outfalls to Absecon Inlet, even though two drainage outfalls were authorized by this office in 1981; the drainage along a road along the northwestern side of the property, which drains directly to Absecon Inlet through stormwater piping; the drainage along a road along the southwestern side of the property, which drains directly to the Frank S. Farley Marina through stormwater piping; and the drainage along Huron Avenue, which drains directly to the subject property through a gravel driveway. Where the standing water pooled up along the driveway, Mr. Bonner considered this area to be a puddle and not wetlands, although this inundated area connects a wetland on either side of the driveway. After walking the perimeter, we walked the interior of the subject site, taking note of the depressional wetlands, which have formed on top of fill material. The primary source of hydrology for these wetlands is precipitation, which makes off-site drainage improvements impractical.

On July 17, 2019, Brian McPeake, Tom Balance, and Rick Ricciardi called Ed Bonner and Todd Schaible to discuss the additional information to be sent for consideration (see letter dated July 25, 2019). During the call, Mssrs. McPeake and Balance argued that the wetlands landward of the bulkhead were the result of poor grading on the site; that Mr. Bonner noted that one of the areas delineated as a wetland was, in fact, a puddle; that the concept of abandonment no longer applies to determinations made under the 2015 Clean Water Rule; and that the area in question was dry land prior to 1975.

On July 25, 2019, Ed Bonner and Todd Schaible called Jim Haggerty (NAD Regulatory Program Manager) to discuss the question of whether or not wetlands that have formed on top of old fill material meet the definition of waters of the United States, if the fill material was placed for the construction of a facility where the construction of that facility has been delayed for decades. We also discussed that, if this office agrees that wetlands meet the subject exclusion from the definition of waters of the United States, would an accurate delineation of the wetlands for the purposes of completing an Approved Jurisdictional Determination be required. Mr. Haggerty asked several questions related to hydrology (primary source: mainly precipitation; secondary source: limited surface water runoff from very small drainage area); ecological value (minimal wildlife habitat, sediment retention, and pollutant trapping); and direct surface water connections to A1 through A5 waters (possibly after heavy rain events to an inlet and after storm tides to site only). Based on these conditions, Mr. Haggerty recommended that this office not take jurisdiction over these wetlands. Mr. Haggerty also recommended that this office did not have to require an accurate delineation for aquatic resources that are not waters of the United States.

In response to a letter from the agent, dated July 25, 2019, this office neither agrees nor disagrees with the claims made in the letter. However, this office does agree that water-filled depressions created in dry land incidental to construction activity are not waters of the United States per the 2015 Clean Water Rule. This office also agrees that the preamble to this rule does not allow for a case-specific analysis to be used to establish jurisdiction.

Page 5 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.

Table 1. (a)(1) Traditional Navigable Waters

(a)(1) Waters Name	(a)(1) Criteria	Rationale to Support (a)(1) Designation Include High Tide Line or Ordinary High Water Mark indicators, when applicable.
Absecon Inlet	The waterbody is subject to Section 9 or 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act	The Absecon Inlet is subject to the ebb and flow of tide. NOAA's tide charts were used to the elevations of the Mean High Water Line and High Tide Line. The Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Regional Supplement was used to determine the presence and limits of subtidal wetlands.

Table 2. (a)(2) Interstate Waters

(a)(2) Waters Name	Rationale to Support (a)(2) Designation	
N/A	N/A	

Table 3. (a)(3) Territorial Seas

(a)(3) Waters Name	Rationale to Support (a)(3) Designation	
N/A	N/A	

Table 4. (a)(4) Impoundments

(a)(4) Waters Name	Rationale to Support (a)(4) Designation
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Page 6 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

Table 5. (a)(5)Tributaries

(a)(5) Waters Name	Flow Regime	(a)(1)-(a)(3) Water Name to which this (a)(5) Tributary Flows	Tributary Breaks	Rationale for (a)(5) Designation and Additional Discussion. Identify flowpath to (a)(1)-(a)(3) water or attach map identifying the flowpath; explain any breaks or flow through excluded/non-jurisdictional features, etc.
N/A	Choose an item.	N/A	Choose an item.	N/A
N/A	Choose an item.	N/A	Choose an item.	N/A
N/A	Choose an item.	N/A	Choose an item.	N/A
N/A	Choose an item.	N/A	Choose an item.	N/A

Table 6. (a)(6) Adjacent Waters

(a)(6) Waters Name	(a)(1)-(a)(5) Water Name to which this Water is Adjacent	Rationale for (a)(6) Designation and Additional Discussion. Identify the type of water and how the limits of jurisdiction were established (e.g., wetland, 87 Manual/Regional Supplement); explain how the 100-year floodplain and/or the distance threshold was determined; whether this water extends beyond a threshold; explain if the water is part of a mosaic, etc.
N/A	N/A	N/A

Page 7 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

Table 7. (a)(7) Waters

SPOE Name	(a)(7) Waters Name	(a)(1)-(a)(3) Water Name to which this Water has a Significant Nexus	Significant Nexus Determination Identify SPOE watershed; discuss whether any similarly situated waters were present and aggregated for SND; discuss data, provide analysis, and summarize how the waters have more than speculative or insubstantial effect on the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the (a)(1)-(a)(3) water, etc.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 8. (a)(8) Waters

SPOE Name	(a)(8) Waters Name	(a)(1)-(a)(3) Water Name to which this Water has a Significant Nexus	Significant Nexus Determination Identify SPOE watershed; explain how 100-yr floodplain and/or the distance threshold was determined; discuss whether waters were determined to be similarly situated to subject water and aggregated for SND; discuss data, provide analysis, and then summarize how the waters have more than speculative or insubstantial effect the on the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the (a)(1)-(a)(3) water, etc.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Page 8 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

Non-Jurisdictional Waters

Table 9. Non-Waters/No Significant Nexus

SPOE Name	Non-(a)(7)/(a)(8) Waters Name	(a)(1)-(a)(3) Water Name to which this Water DOES NOT have a Significant Nexus	Basis for Determination that the Functions DO NOT Contribute Significantly to the Chemical, Physical, or Biological Integrity of the (a)(1)-(a)(3) Water. Identify SPOE watershed; explain how 100-yr floodplain and/or the distance threshold was determined; discuss whether waters were determined to be similarly situated to the subject water; discuss data, provide analysis, and summarize how the waters did not have more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the (a)(1)-(a)(3) water.
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 10. Non-Waters/Excluded Waters and Features

Paragraph (b) Excluded Feature/Water Name	Rationale for Paragraph (b) Excluded Feature/Water and Additional Discussion.	
Area of Isolated Water Filled Depressions in Dry Land	There is a wetland/non-wetland mosaic on the subject property, where the wetland portions meet the exclusion for water-filled depressions created in dry land incidental to mining or construction activity [(b)(4)(v)]. Since these wetlands are considered exempt from the definition of waters of the United States, their limits were not verified for the purpose of this Approved Jurisdictional Determination. See Additional Comments to Support AJD section above.	
N/A	N/A	

Table 11. Non-Waters/Other

Other Non-Waters of U.S. Feature/Water Name	Rationale for Non-Waters of U.S. Feature/Water and Additional Discussion.	
N/A	N/A	

Page 9 of 7 Version: October 1, 2015

