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): March 4, 2014


C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Utah
   County/parish/borough: Salt Lake
   City: West Valley City
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 40.7351873149576°, Long. -111.974588517248°
   Universal Transverse Mercator: 12 417707.85 4509817.76
   Name of nearest waterbody: Brighton Canal
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: N/A
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Jordan, Utah., 16020204
   ☑ 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): October 22, 2013

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):  
      ☐ TNWs, including territorial seas
      ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      ☐ Relatively permanent waters ² (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.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 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: Wetlands A, B, C and D on this property consist of excavated/scrapped areas and an abandoned excavated channel bottom from an old canal alignment that has been relocated.
      Evidence of this frequent earth moving activity is observable on historic imagery. All 4 features are

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.
located in depressional areas and have no connection to jurisdictional waters, as observed by Corps personnel during an October 22, 2013 site visit. Hydrology comes from a seasonally high water table and local runoff accumulation. There are no natural steams or ponds within or near the site. The relocation of Brighton Canal left an excavated channel bottom (Wetlands B and C) with no connection to the current alignment of the canal. Both ends of the old alignment have been cut off from the canal with 40-50 feet of upland fill. Wetland D is separated from Lee Creek Drain by approximately 280 feet of uplands, and Wetland A is separated from Brighton Canal by approximately 550 feet of uplands. The nearest TNW is the Great Salt Lake, approximately 9 miles northeast of the study area. These features were evaluated for potential physical, chemical and biological connections to jurisdictional waters and none were found. The Corps has determined these features to be intrastate, isolated waters with no significant nexus to a TNW and no interstate commerce connections, therefore, these aquatic features are not subject to Section 404 CWA jurisdiction.

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 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: 16020204 (HUC) Pick List
      Drainage area: 65 acres
      Average annual rainfall: 16.5 inches
      Average annual snowfall: 61 inches
   (ii) Physical Characteristics:

   Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
(a) **Relationship with TNW:**
- [X] Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- [ ] Tributary flows through 3 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **10-15** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **1** (or less) river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **5-10** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **1** (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW:
- Tributary stream order, if known:

(b) **General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):**

- Tributary is: [X] Natural
- [ ] Artificial (man-made). Explain: *Brighton Canal is a man-made feature that conveys diverted water from the Jordan River and terminates into the Great Salt Lake.*
- [ ] Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

**Tributary** properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
- Average width: **10** feet
- Average depth: **6** feet
- Average side slopes: **3:1**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
- [X] Silts
- [ ] Sands
- [ ] Gravel
- [ ] Concrete
- [ ] Muck
- [ ] Cobble
- [ ] Bedrock
- [ ] Vegetation. Type/% cover: [ ]
- [ ] Other. Explain:

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: *Steep banks, regularly maintained as a canal/water conveyance, relatively low flow velocities and low erosion.*

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: *None—the channel is a straight and incised man-made canal constructed only to convey water.*

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): **1 %**

(c) **Flow:**

- Tributary provides for: **Perennial**
- Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20** (or greater)
- Describe flow regime: *The canal receives a constant supply of water from the Jordan River and has year-round flow.*

Other information on duration and volume:
- Surface flow is: **Confined.** Characteristics:
  - [ ] Dye (or other) test performed:

Subsurface flow: **Unknown.** Explain findings:
- [ ] Bed and banks
- [X] OHWM6 (check all indicators that apply):
  - [X] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
  - [X] changes in the character of soil
  - [ ] shelving
  - [X] vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
  - [ ] leaf litter disturbed or washed away
  - [ ] sediment deposition
  - [ ] water staining
  - [ ] other (list):

---

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.
6 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.
Discontinuous OHWM. 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
  - fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
  - physical markings
  - 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: Water is typically discolored or murky with high levels of phosphorus and pathogens and low dissolved oxygen.
Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): Discontinuous, low quality (primarily russian olive)
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics:
- Habitat for:
  - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
  - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
  - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
  - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:
  (a) General Wetland Characteristics:
  Properties:
  - Wetland size: 1.11 acres
  - Wetland type. Explain: Wetlands on site consist of 4 individual saline wet meadow polygons A, B, C and D.
  - Wetland quality. Explain: Wetlands on site are of relatively low quality with strongly saline/alkaline soils. Wetlands A and D occur in scrapped or excavated areas where topsoil has been removed. Wetlands B and C are the remains of the old Brighton Canal alignment, which was re-routed around the property many years ago. Little or no filtration is provided as these wetlands have no surface connection to other waters. Some low quality habitat may exist on site. However, industrial development surrounds the site on all sides, making the site less favorable for wildlife use.
  Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: Wetlands on site do not cross or serve as state boundaries. Nearest state boundary is more than 50 miles from the site.

  (b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
  Flow is: No Flow. Explain: There is no flow relationship between any of the on-site wetlands and adjacent tributaries.

  Surface flow is: Not present
  Characteristics: No surface connection exists between wetlands and tributary, as verified by Corps personnel.

  Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings: Only wetlands B and C are close enough to a tributary (separated by approximately 40 feet of uplands) to potentially have subsurface flows. However, these wetlands do not hold water often or long enough to have a substantial connection or contribution to the tributary.
  - Dye (or other) test performed:

  (c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
  - Directly abutting
  - Not directly abutting
    - Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:
    - Ecological connection. Explain:

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: Wetlands B and C are cut off from Brighton Canal by approximately 40 feet of uplands. Wetlands A and D are separated from the tributary by 300 and 900 feet of uplands, respectively.

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are 10-15 river miles from TNW.
Project waters are 5-10 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: No Flow.
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the 500-year or greater floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: Hydrology consists of groundwater interception and storm water accumulation only, so ponding is relatively brief and infrequent. Water is highly saline and may contain pollutants typically found in an industrialized area.

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): A 20-foot low quality riparian buffer exists along portions of the abandoned canal channel (wetlands B and C). Vegetation consists mostly of invasive species such as Russian olive and tamarisk.
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: Lepidium latifolium 5-10%, Suaeda occidentalis 0-20%, Distichlis spicata 0-60%, Atriplex hortensis 0-70%, Phragmites australis 0-10%, Bassia hyssopifolia 0-80%, Phalaris arundinacea 0-5%.

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: 4
Approximately 1.11 acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The entire study area is surrounded by industrial development and the biological benefit from the wetlands on site is low. However, potential foraging or nesting habitat may exist on site. No fish species are found within the study area. Hydrology consists of groundwater interception and storm water accumulation only, so filtration benefits are low. Wetlands on site do not contain a dominance of desirable or favorable wetland vegetation species and do not show signs of flow patterns or prolonged ponding.

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: Bright Canals has a direct surface connection to the Great Salt Lake, the nearest TNW, and has the ability to carry pollutants and provide some level of wildlife habitat. However, the contribution to the physical, chemical or biological integrity of the TNW from this tributary is unsubstantial. The flow entering the TNW from this tributary is miniscule compared with the size of the lake. The isolated wetlands being evaluated on this JD form have no chemical, physical or biological connection to the tributary and, therefore, no relationship with the TNW. This was verified on site by Corps personnel.

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 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: 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:

See Footnote # 3.
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.

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.**
   - 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).

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):**

   - 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, __________ wide.
    - Other non-wetland waters: __________ acres.
    - Wetlands: __________ acres.

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: Based on available information, the isolated wetlands being evaluated on this JD form have no chemical, physical or biological connection to the tributary and, therefore, no relationship with the TNW.

   - 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, __________ wide.
    - Lakes/ponds: __________ acres.
    - Other non-wetland waters: __________ acres. List type of aquatic resource:
    - Wetlands: __________ acres.

---

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

10 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.
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: 1.11 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: Frontier Corporation USA
- ☑ 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-SALT LAKE CITY SOUTH
- ☑ 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 Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☑ Photographs: ☑ Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth
  or ☑ Other (Name & Date): Frontier Corporation USA
- ☑ 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:

The study area is within an industrial subdivision and has been disturbed by earth moving activities such as topsoil removal, excavation for borrow material, dumping and grading. The soil data obtained from the test pits indicate this disturbance. Though the NRCS soil surveys show these areas to contain hydric soils, none of the test pits contained hydric soil indicators except within wetland B. The nearest water body, Brighton Canal, runs along the southern and western boundary, just outside of the study area. This canal used to run diagonally through the site until it was relocated to its current location around 2004-2005. There are no natural water features and no irrigation on site. The nearest TNW is the Great Salt Lake, approximately 9 miles northeast of the study area. The Corps has determined these features to be isolated with no significant nexus to a TNW and, therefore, has no regulatory authority over this site.