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.

	BACKGROUND	INICODRANTION
>=(RACKGROUND	

	DEDOCT COMPLETION DATE FOR	400001/50	UIDIODIOTIONA	DETERMINIATION (ID)	
Α.	REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR	APPROVED	JURISDICTIONAL	. DETERMINATION (JD):	January 6, 2020

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Sacramento District, Gibellini Mine, SPK-2013-01103

Ь.	DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER. Sacramento District, Gibernin Mine, SFR-2013-01103
C.	PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: State: Nevada County/parish/borough: Eureka County City: Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 39.2000°, Long116.0669° Universal Transverse Mercator: 11 580566.63 4339394.68 Name of nearest waterbody: Cockalorum Wash Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: N/A Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Little Smoky-Newark Valleys, 16060006 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: January 6, 2020 Field Determination. Date(s):
	CTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
Α.	RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
	ere Are no "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) ne 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:
В.	CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
	ere Are no "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area quired
	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: linear feet, wide, and/or acres. Wetlands: acres.
	c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List Elevation of established OHWM (if known):
	 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 associated with this jurisdictional determination are located in the Little Smokey Valley, which is directly south of Newark Valley. Little Smokey Valley is bordered on the north by the Diamond Mountains, on the east and southeast by the Pancake Range, and on the west by the Fish Creek and Antelope Ranges, isolating the valley geographically and hydrologically from other basins. Northward it opens into the

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.

Newark Valley and is separated by a low divide from Sand Spring Valley to the south. Drainages of the Smokey Valley are considered to be tributaries to the Newark Valley because the two valleys are connected through groundwater exchange. The drainages associated with this jurisdictional determination are all located on the western portion of the Little Smokey Valley and eventually flow northward towards Newark Valley. The drainages are all ephemeral in nature and ultimately disappear within a large alluvial fan within Little Smokey Valley before reaching Fish Creek. Drainages D24 and D25 flow southeast into Cockalorum Wash, which flows into the valley floor where it joins with a network of channels that flow to the north eventually joining with Fish Creek. This network of channels terminates in a large playa (Newark Lake). Drainages D01-D23 also eventually join Fish Creek upstream of the confluence with Cockalorum Wash. A previous determination was made on washes ULD 1-3 (D-13, 14, and 15) for the Mine Expansion. ULD 10 does have an overland connection with Fish Creek through an excavated ditch outside of the project area but the drainage does not exhibit a continuous OHWM to Fish Creek. ULD 4, 5, 9 and 10 did not exhibit OHWM characteristics within the project area. ULD 6, 7 and 8 did exhibit OHWM characteristics but disappeared before reaching Fish Creek Road. Fish Creek flows northward into Newark Valley and ultimately terminates in a large playa (Newark Lake). The Newark Valley was previously determined to be a closed basin under SPK-1998-25194 Bald Mountain Mine.

There are no connections to TNW's or RPW's that might eventually flow into a TNW. No connections to foreign or interstate commerce were identified.

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

.

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

Drainage area: Pick List inches Average annual rainfall: 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: Identify flow route to TNW5: 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 ☐ 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 ☐ multiple observed or predicted flow events sediment deposition abrupt change in plant community water staining

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.

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.

		☐ 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:
	(iii)	Chemical Characteristics: Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.). Explain: Identify specific pollutants, if known:
	(iv)	Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply): Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): 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.	Cha	aracteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW
	(i)	Physical Characteristics: (a) General Wetland Characteristics: 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: Surface flow is: Pick List Characteristics: Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings: □ 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: ☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:
		(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW. Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW. Flow is from: Pick List. Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the Pick List 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: Identify specific pollutants, if known:
	(iii)	Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):

⁷lbid.

	□ Riparian buffer. Character	istics (type, average width) <u>:</u>	
	☐ Vegetation type/percent co	ver. Explain:		
	☐ Habitat for:	·		
	☐ Federally Listed speci-	es. Explain findings:		
	☐ Fish/spawn areas. Exp	olain findings:		
	☐ Other environmentally	-sensitive species. Explain	n findings:	
	☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversi	ty. Explain findings:		
3.	Characteristics of all wetlands a All wetland(s) being considere Approximately acres in	ed in the cumulative analys	3,	
	For each wetland, specify the	following:		
	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:

- 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):

۱.	TNWs and Ad	ljacent Wetlands.	Check all that apply	and provide size estimates in review area:
	☐ TNWs:	linear feet,	wide, Or	acres.
	☐ Wetlands a	djacent to TNWs:	acres.	

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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:
Non-RPWs ⁸ 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:
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.
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.
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.
Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.9 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).
PLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, GRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH TERS (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:

E.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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.

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. Identify type(s) of waters: 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: ☐ Other: (explain, if not covered above):
	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): 241,183.9 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.
SE	CTION IV: 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: Three Parameters Plus, Inc. 2013. Waters of the United States Jurisdictional Determination for the American Vanadium Gibellini Mine Project, Eureka County, Nevada. ☑ 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; Eightmile Well 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)
	Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: SPK-1998-25194 Bald Mountain Mine, April 17, 2012; SPK-2012-00541 White Pine Pan Project - Midway Gold, August 15, 2012; SPK-2013-01103 Gibellini Mine Project, April 2, 2014 and November 25, 2014.
	Applicable/supporting case law: Applicable/supporting case law: Applicable/supporting scientific literature: Eakin, T.E. 1960. Water Resources Reconnaissance Series Report 1: Ground water appraisal of Newark Valley, White Pine County, Nevada. USGS. Snyder, C.T. 1963. Hydrology of stock-water development in the Ely Grazing District, Nevada. USGS, Geological Survey Water-supply paper #1475-
	L. Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

The Little Smokey Valley watershed is almost entirely under the management of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). There are a few private in-holdings by several ranches, specifically Fish Creek Ranch, and much of the BLM land has historically been used by ranchers holding grazing leases. Surface water is derived almost entirely from precipitation within the drainage area and occurs mainly as snow in the higher elevations. Much of the moisture infiltrates in the porous rock material. When water is present, most of the drainages at higher elevations collect and flow out into the alluvial fan in Little Smokey Valley and are absorbed by the alluvium. Under natural conditions, only the major mountain streams, such as Cockalorum Wash would have flowed into the playa areas or from the valleys, and then only during periods of large run-off events. Most of the larger mountain streams, such as Fish Creek, have been diverted and utilized for irrigation. Fish Creek is classified as an ephemeral stream with flow occurring only during infrequent storms in the summer and in the winter. Drainages D01-D25 are located on the western portion of the valley and drain the eastern slope of the Fish Creek Mountains. Drainages D01-D23 all drain to the east towards a large alluvial fan that terminates on the valley floor. Drainages D24-D25 flow eventually into Cockalorum Wash to the south of the project area. Cockalorum Wash does have an overland connection to the Fish Creek Springs drainage.

Fish Creek is classified as an ephemeral stream with flow occurring only during infrequent storms in the summer and in the winter. Drainages ULD 04-10 are located in the central portion of the valley and drain the eastern slope of the Fish Creek Mountains. Drainages ULD 04-10 all drain to the northeast towards a large alluvial fan that terminates on the valley floor. Drainages ULD 04-10 flow toward Fish Creek but do not appear to connect to the creek before losing OHWM indicators. ULD-10 does not exhibit a continuous OHWM to Fish Creek.

All drainages within the project area ultimately flow into the large alluvial fan and drain towards Fish Creek. The area is relatively remote with limited services and virtually no water-dependent activities. The Corps found no evidence of interstate commerce within the Little Smokey Valley and concluded that the drainages associated with the Gibellini Mine Project are all intrastate, isolated waters that drain to the Newark Valley, which is a closed basin and are therefore non-jurisdictional.