# 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 JURIS	DICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): August 31, 203
--	--

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Sacramento District, Western Energy Hub Project, SPK-2009-00203-UO C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: County/parish/borough: Millard City: Delta State: Utah Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 39.68638°, Long. -112.21230° Universal Transverse Mercator: 12 396044.44 4393652.78 Name of nearest waterbody: Sevier River Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: None Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Utah Lake. Utah., 16020201 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: **08/11/2010** Field Determination. Date(s): **SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS** 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 no "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 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: linear feet. wide, and/or acres. Wetlands: acres.

# Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Not Applicable.

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: All three historical conveyances located on the project site lack a distinguishable bed and bank and have no sign of an ordinary high water mark. The two ditches and swale run generally northwest to southeast through the project area. A raised gravel east-west road is present along the southern border and there are no culverts under the road connecting the site to areas south of the road. No evidence of water flow is present over the gravel road and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

<sup>&</sup>lt;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).

Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

there is no evidence of surficial flows. USGS topograpic maps identify Ditch 1 as an "Abandoned Ditch". A cultural review of the site, conducted by Deron Lawrence of Entrix, determined that Ditch 1 had been created for industrial effluent from a proposed sugar beet plant in the 1930s, which was never built. Greasewood (FACU) is the dominant vegetation and is as dense within the channels as in areas adjacent to the channels.

## **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: Pick List
Drainage area: Pick List
Average annual rainfall: inches
Average annual snowfall: inches

# (ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.

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

Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

		Identify flow route to TNW <sup>5</sup> : Tributary stream order, if known:
	(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  Average depth: feet  Average side slopes: Pick List.
		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: Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: Tributary geometry: Pick List Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %
	(c)	Flow: Tributary provides for: Pick List Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List Describe flow regime: Other information on duration and volume:
		Surface flow is: Pick List. Characteristics:
		Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:  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 changes in the character of soil destruction of terrestrial vegetation shelving vegetation matted down, bent, or absent leaf litter disturbed or washed away sediment deposition water staining 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:
(iii)	Cha E	emical Characteristics: cracterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.). cxplain: ntify specific pollutants, if known:

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;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. <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.

	(iv)		Riparian corridor. Character Wetland fringe. Characterist Habitat for:     Federally Listed species     Fish/spawn areas. Expl	tics: s. Explain findings: ain findings: sensitive species. Explain fin		
2.	Cha	aract	eristics of wetlands adjace	nt to non-TNW that flow dir	ectly or indirectly into TNV	V
	<b>(i)</b>		Wetland type. Explain Wetland quality. Explain	res	ain:	
		(b)	General Flow Relationship Flow is: <b>Pick List</b> . Explain			
			Surface flow is: Pick List Characteristics:			
			Subsurface flow: Pick List  Dye (or other) test p			
		(c)	Wetland Adjacency Determ Directly abutting Not directly abutting Discrete wetland hy Ecological connecti	drologic connection. Explain on. Explain:	:	
		(d)	Flow is from: <b>Pick List.</b>			
	(ii)	Cha	emical Characteristics: tracterize wetland system (e., haracteristics; etc.). Explain htify specific pollutants, if kr		, oil film on surface; water qu	ality; general watershed
	(iii)		Riparian buffer. Characteris Vegetation type/percent cove Habitat for:  Federally Listed species Fish/spawn areas. Expla	er. Explain: s. Explain findings: ain findings: sensitive species. Explain fin		
3.	Cha	All	wetland(s) being considered	icent to the tributary (if any in the cumulative analysis: Potal are being considered in the	ick List	
		For	each wetland, specify the fo	llowing:		
			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:
- 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, wide, 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:
	Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):  Tributary waters: linear feet wide.  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.

\_\_

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

	Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):
	☐ Tributary waters: linear feet, wide.
	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 jurisidictional. 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>
	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).
DE	OLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, GRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY
	CH 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.
	which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
	Interstate isolated waters. Explain:
	Other factors. Explain:
Ide	ntify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:
Prov	vide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
	Γributary waters: linear feet, wide.
	Other non-wetland waters: acres.
$\Box$	Identify type(s) of waters:
Ц,	Wetlands: acres.
	N-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.
ш,	The first metal metals from the substitution of the substitution o

E.

F.

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

<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.

	<ul> <li>□ 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).</li> <li>□ Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain:</li> <li>□ Other: (explain, if not covered above):</li> </ul>
	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, wide.  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, wide.  Lakes/ponds: acres.  Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:  Wetlands: acres.
Α.	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: 1:24K; UT-JERICHO   USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Map- Delta Area, Utah- Part of Millard County   National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:   State/Local wetland inventory map(s).   FEMA/FIRM maps:   100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)   Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):   or Other (Name & Date):   Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: 2010-00715-UO, July 14, 2010   Applicable/supporting case law:
	<ul> <li>□ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:</li> <li>□ Other information (please specify): A cultural review of the site, conducted by Deron Lawrence of Entrix, determined that Ditch 1 had been created for industrial effluent from a proposed sugar beet plant in the 1930s, which was never built.</li> </ul>

## B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

The three channels in question lack the basic characteristics of regulated conveyances. If any of these three channels were to experience regular flows, they would drain into the lower portion of the Sevier River, and eventually into Sevier Lake. Sevier Lake is an intermettent lake that has been mostly dry throughout recorded history. Sevier Lake and the lower half of the Sevier River are non-jurisdictional waters (see file #2010-00715-UO).