SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION


C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Utah  County: Kane  City: Alton

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat: 37.4000 N, Long: -112.4484 W

Name of water being evaluated on this JD form: Wetlands 1 through 10.

Universal Transverse Mercator: 12.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: August 6, 2010.

Field Determination. Date(s): May 7, 2010.

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 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 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: ______ linear feet ______ width (ft) and/or ______ acres.

Wetlands: ______ acres.

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

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): ______.

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: The waters identified as Wetlands 1 through 10, and any associated seeps are intrastate isolated waters. Flows

---

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.
terminate and infiltrate within the project area. The last observation of jurisdictional features (scour, bed/bank, ordinary high water mark, etc) is about 1,000 feet east of Lower Robinson Creek.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs: NOT APPLICABLE

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS: NOT APPLICABLE

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION: NOT APPLICABLE

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE: NOT APPLICABLE

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): 4

- 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:

- 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: 1.4 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

4 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.
Precipitation generally falls as snow in the winter and rain in the summer. The average annual total precipitation is 16.57 inches. Livestock grazing has been the primary land use in the project area. A small network of abandoned catchment ponds and ditches are removed in preparation for the proposed surface mine which is not a water dependent activity. No other potential interstate commerce connections were found.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The center of the Alton Coal Development, LLC, Coal Hollow Mine Project, is approximately 3 miles south of the town of Alton, Utah. Alton Coal Development, LLC has submitted to the Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), an application to lease Federal coal adjacent to their 635.64-acres of private lands. The Alton Coal Lease Tract has been determined by BLM and encompasses approximately 3,600 acres of federal coal reserves. Under the BLM Lease Application process, and in response to Alton Coal Development LLC’s application, BLM plans to competitively offer the Alton Coal Lease Tract to interested parties in accordance with BLM’s standard terms, conditions, and policies. BLM's draft Environmental Impact Statement for Alton Coal Development LLC's Federal Coal Lease Application and a competitive offer for the Federal coal lease are pending. While BLM's actions are pending, Alton Coal Development LLC is proceeding with a State of Utah application to mine on their privately held lands. Alton Coal Development, LLC has submitted a complete application (File # C/025/005) to Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining (DOGM) that, if approved, would permit surface coal mining on their 635.64 acres of private land in the Alton Coal Field. Kane County Road 136 bisects a portion of these privately held lands. To facilitate the proposed mining operations, Alton Coal Development, LLC, requested Kane County temporarily relocate part of the road. On December 12, 2008, BLM granted Kane County a 66-foot right-of-way to re-route approximately 3.1 miles of Kane County Road 136 through about 27 acres of BLM-administered land. Roadway construction is proposed after DOGM, and other authorizing agencies, grant Alton Coal Development, LLD approval to begin mining.

In January 2010, a Wetlands Delineation was prepared for the privately-held lands. On May 7, 2010, a field visit was conducted to verify the delineation. On May 18, 2010, a Wetland and Stream Channel Delineation was prepared for the Kane County Road 136 realignment. The May 2010 submittal included the revised wetland delineation maps requested during the field visit.

Livestock grazing has been the primary land use in the project area. A small network of abandoned catchment ponds and ditches are evidence of past homestead and ranching efforts. Earthen dams were placed in surface drainages to create catchment ponds for stock watering. The remnant of one pond and ditch, visible below Wetland 2, is generally dominated by upland vegetation. In recent years, approximately 35 cattle grazed heavily near Wetlands 1 through 10 and watered at their seeps. In November 2009, all livestock were removed in preparation for the proposed surface mine which is not a water dependent activity. No other potential interstate commerce connections were found.

Precipitation generally falls as snow in the winter and rain in the summer. The average annual total precipitation is 16.57 inches. The average annual snowfall is 83.5 inches. During the growing season, most of the precipitation (4.7 inches) occurs during the summer month of July, August, and September. If conditions are optimal, ephemeral drainages within the project area can have surface water flow in response to snow melt and rain events.
The waters identified as Wetland 1 through 10 are located in privately-held lands, on an elevated ridge of low permeability Tropic Shale bedrock. According to the Alton Coal Development Soil Survey Map, Wetlands 1 and 2 are located on 8 to 25 percent slopes and Wetlands 3 through 10 are located on 1 to 5 percent slopes. The DOGM, Coal Hollow Mine and Reclamation Plan (MRP) includes flow monitoring for eight seeps near ten of the wetlands. No seeps were identified within the other two wetland boundaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland # /acreage</th>
<th>DOGM, MRP Spring #</th>
<th>Reported Seep Discharge Rate Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 1 (0.04 acres)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 2 (0.04 acres)</td>
<td>SP-39</td>
<td>Less than 0.05 gpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 3 (0.22 acres)</td>
<td>SP-36</td>
<td>Less than 0.05 gpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 4 (0.76 acres)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 5 (0.21 acres)</td>
<td>SP-15</td>
<td>0.1 to 1.5 gpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 6 (0.02 acres)</td>
<td>SP-22A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 7 (0.03 acres)</td>
<td>SP-22</td>
<td>0 to 0.5 gpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 8 (0.01 acres)</td>
<td>SP-23</td>
<td>0 to 1.5 gpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 9 (0.04 acres)</td>
<td>SP-24</td>
<td>0 to 0.3 gpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland 10 (0.03 acres)</td>
<td>SP-25</td>
<td>0 to 0.5 gpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The field visit found limited flow discharging, downslope from Wetlands 1 through 3, and related dry unnamed drainage channels that terminated within the project valley. Specifically, Wetland 1 flows into an unnamed drainage channel that joins the Wetland 2 drainage channel, about 600 feet downstream. The Wetland 2 drainage channel flows into a small man-made catchment pond historically used for stock watering. When pond capacity is reached, surface water overflows into a short man-made ditch that enters an unnamed drainage channel. At about 325 feet downstream of the pond, no evidence of OHWM (bed/bank, scour, etc) was found. Wetland 3 flows into an unnamed drainage channel that braids within the project area, about 1000 feet downstream of Wetland 3 (See Field Visit Photos). USGS mapping has not designated blue lines for the unnamed drainage channels below Wetlands 1 through 3 and, during the field visit, no surface connection to Lower Robinson Creek was found. Wetlands 4 through 10 are upslope and have no surface water flow paths or connectivity to Wetlands 1 through 3 or any drainage channels.

The waters identified as Wetlands 1 through 10 and any associated seeps, have limited or intermittent surface water flow and do not support recreation, fishery, commercial, or industrial uses. No interstate commerce connections were found that would be adversely affected as a result of degradation or destruction of these waters.

Therefore, the Corps has determined that Wetlands 1 through 10 are non-jurisdictional because they are intrastate, isolated, non-navigable waters with no interstate commerce connection.