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

Α.	REPORT COMPLETION	N DATE FOR APPROVEI	D.IURISDICTIONAL	DETERMINATION (JD): September 28, 2010
----	-------------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------	-------------------------

В.	DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Sacramento District, EDAW Griff Creek Site Placer County, SPK-2008-
	01122-NO

C.	PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: State: California County/parish/borough: Placer City: Kings Beach Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 39.2657059370997°, Long120.017679334418° Universal Transverse Mercator: 10 757299.07 4350503.31 Name of nearest waterbody: Griff Creek Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Lake Tahoe Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Lake Tahoe. California, Nevada, 16050101 □ Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request. For the following waters: Roadside Ditch □ 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: Tributaries of Griff Creek (ID01, ID02, ID03), Wetlands (MRW 1, 2, and 3) Ephemeral Drainage ED01.					
D.	REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): Office (Desk) Determination. Date: July 29, 2010 Field Determination. Date(s):					
	CTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS DIA SECTION IN DETERMINATION OF HUDISDICTION					
Α.	RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.					
	re Are no "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the ew 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.					
The	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): 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: 264 linear feet, wide, 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): Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: Pondeido disch greated in unlands that drains rauseff and does not connect to any potential waters of the					

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

U.S.

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

 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).

Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

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. NA

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. NA

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:

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

- 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): NA
- 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): 5 NA

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): Roadside ditch was constructed in uplands.					
	Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> 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.					
\$F(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.					
<u>SE</u>	CHONIV: DATA SOURCES.					
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; CA-MARTIS PEAK USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: 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: □ Applicable/supporting case law: □ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: □ Other information (please specify): 					

⁵ 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.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: