

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): May 30, 2015

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Savannah District, QT Project No. 742R, File number pending

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: **Georgia** County/parish/borough: **Cobb** City: **Austell** **33.7756** **84.5637**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. ° **Pick List** Long. ° **Pick List**

Name of nearest waterbody: **Universal Transverse Mercator**
Unnamed Trib of Chattahoochee River

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Chattahoochee River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **03130002 Upper Middle Chattahoochee**

- 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):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

are no

There **Pick List** "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 **Pick List** "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):¹

- TNWs, including territorial seas
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
 Relatively permanent waters² (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: **234** linear feet: **6.5** width (ft) and/or acres.
Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Pick List**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): **952.22 to 931.30 (average endpoints)**

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³

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

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

² 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).

³ 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 waterbody⁴ 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: **Pick List** Stream 2: 35,000 square feet, 0.80 acre, 0.0013 square mile
Drainage area: **Pick List** Chattahoochee River* : 1,196800 acres, 1.870 square miles
Average annual rainfall: inches 49.67 inches - Fulton County Airport (2000-2012)
Average annual snowfall: inches * interpolated between USGS gaging stations (02336000 and 02336490)

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW. TWO
 Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW. to Stream 2 and then into a first order trib of the Chattahoochee River.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW. 1.55
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW. .035
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW. 1.14
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW. .035
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A

ST-2 begins on site and drains toward to ST-1 on-site. St-1 runs 1,670 feet
Identify flow route to TNW⁵: to a direct trib that flows 6,300 feet to the Chattahoochee R.

Tributary stream order, if known:

ST-2 is a first order stream as are two others downstream that join ST-1 (Stahler, 1952)

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

⁵ 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:
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

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

Average width: feet **3 feet**
Average depth: feet **0.25 feet**
Average side slopes: **Pick List**. **20 to 40 %, approximately 4:1 to 2:1**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

Silts Sands Concrete
 Cobbles Gravel Muck
 Bedrock Vegetation. Type/% cover:
 Other. Explain: **Soil** **Herbaceous/Shrub/10-20%**

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: **some headcut, minor grade controls**

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

Tributary geometry: **Pick List** **Weak trapezoidal**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): **0.08 %**

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick** **rain events >0.25 inch = 30-36/year**

List Describe flow regime: **ephemeral**

Other information on duration and volume: **only flows with significant precipitation. SCS TR-55 2-yr peak (0.28 cfs)**

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. Characteristics: **non-existent during three observations in March/May/June**

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: **No groundwater interaction observed**

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (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.⁷ 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: **N/A -No Flow**

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

Colloquial trash accumulation

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

- (iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**
- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): **None**
 - Wetland fringe. Characteristics: **None**
 - Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings: **None**
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: **None**
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: **None**
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: **None**

2. **Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW**

(i) **Physical Characteristics:**

- (a) General Wetland Characteristics: **N/A**

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: **No direct connection**

Surface flow is: **Pick List** **None**

Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: **No indication of groundwater discharge or recharge**

Dye (or other) test performed:

- (c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW: **N/A**

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. **1.55 miles**

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW. **1.14**

Flow is from: **Pick List**. **ST-1 to ST-2 to Direct Trib to Chattahoochee To Chattahoochee River**

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** floodplain.

No wetland, but all but the bottom 2,125 feet of the direct trib if above the 500-year floodplain (9-21-09 event)

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: **N/A**

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iii) **Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):**

Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): **N/A**

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: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis. **NO NWI wetlands in the vicinity, only impounded small ponds on tribs.**

For each wetland, specify the following:

Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres) Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres)

N/A

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: ST-2 providing negligible pollutant addition or buffer, hydrological contribution, or aquatic biological value.

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? **Not beyond a speculative or insubstantial amount.**
- 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? **No. It is dry most of the time.**
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs? **Not beyond a speculative or insubstantial amount.**
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW? **There is a hydrological connection, but the two-year max flow (0.28 cfs) is only .0001% of even the estimated mean discharge of the Chattahoochee River (2,739 cfs) at the discharge point***

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below: *interpolated from USGS gaging station data upstream and downstream of the discharge point.

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: **Absence based on evidence of above bullets.**
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: **Swale has weak OHWM, infrequent and insignificant flows, small total length, width, and depth, remote from watershed, and insubstantial chemical/physical/biological contributions in the watershed**
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: **No wetlands present in the sub-basin drainage associated with the swale in question.**

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. **None in review area.**
 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: **ST-1 in which the relevant reach drains to has an NC 4.11 score of 25 (intermittent flow regime)**

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

- Tributary waters: 234 linear feet 6.5 width (ft).
 - Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: Intermittent stream

3. Non-RPWs⁸ 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: 234 linear feet 6.5 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: N/A
 - 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: N/A

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. N/A

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. N/A

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹ Closest impoundment is Lake Careca, an in-line 2-acre lake- 1,870 d.s. As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

- Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or jurisdictional and downstream of review area
- 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):¹⁰

- 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. N/A
- 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: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

¹⁰Prior 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 estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: 234 linear feet 6.5 width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: N/A
- Wetlands: acres. N/A

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. N/A
- 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). **Migratory Bird Rule would not apply**
- Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: **See above and below**
- 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): N/A

- 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): 187 linear feet, 3.0 width (ft). 561 square feet or 0.012 acre
- 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). Cite scale & quad name: 7.5 minute (1:24,000), Mableton quadrangle
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Madison Sandy Loam, eroded (Web Soil Survey)
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Mableton quad
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): N/A
- FEMA/FIRM maps: Panels 13121C0214F and 13121C0218F, 9/18/2013
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: 902' (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):
or Other (Name & Date): FEMA panels noted above
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

See attached sheet and the larger delineation report for more related details.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD

The proposed redevelopment site would be an expansion of an existing gas and convenient store located in the 8 digit Hydrologic Unit Code 03130002 known as the Middle Upper Chattahoochee watershed. The site drains via ephemeral and weak intermittent channels to another tributary that empties into the Chattahoochee River, Traditional Navigable Water (TNW), at a point where the river has drained over 1,870 square miles or 1,196,800 acres. Stream 2 on site is the Relevant Reach (RR) under consideration. It has a watershed of 0.8 acre and a peak storm discharge of 0.28 cubic feet per second (cfs). Stream 1 (GPS 33.7756, 84.5637), the receiving drainage for Stream 2, has a watershed an order of magnitude larger than Stream 2. The drainage area of Stream 1 is 7.99 acres, but the Stream 1 channel is also dry most of the time. The land uses within the watershed Stream 1, Stream 2, and its receiving tributary that delivers flow to the Chattahoochee River is dominated by big box light industrial and warehousing (such as Hartman Road Industrial Park), followed by commercial development, and then residential development. The water quality expected from this relatively dense land use would typically be of low to moderate quality. There was no water on site during any of the on-site surveys conducted so no water quality sampling was possible.

The segment of the Chattahoochee River that is the receiving water for drainage from the RR and its sub-basin is compromised by urban runoff and combined sewer overflows such that it does not meet its designated use. Fecal Coliforms, Fish Consumption Guidance, PCBs, and Lead are the primary concerns and violated criteria. Regardless of magnitude, the drainage from the proposed project site would not be expected to alleviate these concerns. Alternately, the particular input of the RR would be expected to be inconsequential. The watershed of the RR (0.8 acre) is 0.0000006 the size of the watershed of the Chattahoochee at the point of confluence. The peak flow of the RR (0.28cfs for a 2-year 24-hour storm) is just 0.0001 of the mean flow of 2,739cfs of the Chattahoochee at the point of confluence. The RR is only 187 feet in length, has no or weak bed and bank at points (especially the last 72 feet before it joins Stream 1), has infrequent and insignificant flows, supports no protected species nor even any aquatic life, and is remote from the TNW (Stream 2 drainage is located 1.55 river miles upstream of the Chattahoochee).

Based on the above considerations, it seems reasonable to conclude that the RR (Stream 2) would not have more than an insubstantial or speculative effect on the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the Chattahoochee River.

Hydrographic data was interpolated and extrapolated to point of discharge using data sources from these three USGS gaging stations: Atlanta, Fulton County (02336000), Chattahoochee at GA 280 (02336490), and Fairburn (02337170).