

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 JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): December 17, 2010

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Sacramento District, El Dorado Ivanpah Transmission Line, SPK-2010-00576-SG

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: **Nevada** County/parish/borough: **Clark** City: **Searchlight**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. **35.542°**, Long. **-115.119°**
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: **Piute Wash – An A2 water which crosses the Nevada/California Border approximately 60.0 miles from the project area.**

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Colorado River/Lake Mohave**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **15030102**

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: **Approved jurisdictional determination has been done for the Ivanpah Dry Lake and associated drainages. Roach Lake drainages are being submitted on a separate form. Jurisdictional drainages associated with Piute Wash have been submitted on a separate form.**

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: **December 17, 2010**

Field Determination. Date(s):

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: The waters assessed on this form did not have a continuous ordinary high water mark to Piute Wash, and in most cases terminated into upland areas. These were waters that were found not to have a significant nexus to Piute Wash due to topographical barriers or because flow does not appear to be sufficient in any given year to create a continuous OHWM to Piute Wash. A discontinuous OHWM in and of itself does not necessarily preclude jurisdiction but given other factors that were identified in the field (i.e. no connection with Piute Wash, Drainages end in upland and do not continue, no evidence of scour or flow across roadways).

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet, wide, and/or **0.079** 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):³

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.

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
Explain: **A number**

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs: 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.

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size: **675,301 acres**
Drainage area: **11357 acres**
Average annual rainfall: **7.72 inches**
Average annual snowfall: **1.3 inches**

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through **2** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **20-25** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **20-25** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **20-25** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **20-25** aerial (straight) miles from RPW. Not Applicable – no RPW’s found within the area.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: Piute Wash crosses into California approximately 60.0 miles downstream of project area

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: The waters assessed on this form did not have a continuous ordinary high water mark to Piute Wash, and in most cases terminated into upland areas. These were waters that were found not to have a significant nexus to Piute Wash due to topographical barriers or because flow does not appear to be sufficient in any given year to create a continuous OHWM to Piute Wash. A discontinuous OHWM in and of itself does not necessarily preclude jurisdiction but given other factors that were identified in the field (i.e. no connection with Piute Wash, Drainages end in upland and do not continue, no evidence of scour or flow across roadways).

Tributary stream order, if known: **1**

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

Tributary is: Natural

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

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.

- Artificial (man-made). Explain:
- Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: **2-4** feet
 Average depth: **1** feet
 Average side slopes: **Vertical (1:1 or less).**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Explain: | | |

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: **Relatively stable**

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: **None present**

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): **2-5 %**

(c) **Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **Ephemeral flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **2-5**

Describe flow regime: **Very flashy system, responds to storm events.**

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined.** Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Unknown.** Explain findings:

- Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ Explain: **These washes do not appear to be connected to Piute Wash tributaries. It appears that they terminate in upland areas before reaching larger tributaries.**

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Explain: **No water present. When water is present, it probably carries a high sediment load**

Identify specific pollutants, if known: **None known except for sediment**

(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: **Possible habitat for Desert tortoise**

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.

⁷Ibid.

- 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: 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: **These drainages do not appear to connect directly to Piute Wash tributaries. Based on past site observations in the watershed and aerial photographic interpretation, these drainages terminate in uplands before reaching NV 66, NV 70 and NV 94. There is a significant break in the OHWM (probably around 0.06 miles).** Piute Wash is an A2 water the crosses the Nevada State line approximately 60.0 miles south of the project area. The washes associated with this form are those that were determined to have no direct or indirect connection with Piute Wash, and either terminated in upland before reaching Piute Wash, or lost the necessary features to be considered a tributary of Piute Wash (i.e. – defined bed and bank, continuous OHWM, lack of channel features, large areas of upland between Piute and isolated drainages). **Therefore, the Corps is declining jurisdiction over the following ephemeral drainages based on the lack of a significant nexus to the Colorado River. Based on the distance, soil characteristics, water quantity and field observations, it is unlikely that water from these drainage area have the opportunity or potential to affect water quality in the Colorado River.**

- 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: NA
- 3. **Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly about 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: NA

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-RPWs⁸ 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:

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.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).

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):¹⁰

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

¹⁰Prior 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.

- 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.
 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: **These ephemeral drainages do not flow directly or indirectly into Piute Wash. The majority either terminate in upland habitat or do not contain the characteristics of a "stream or drainage" to Piute Wash. Observations were made that in the case of a road crossing, many of these washes did not appear to cross the roadways and this would have been evident because of grading activities along the road. These drainages contained discontinuous OHWM's that terminated in upland habitat.**
- 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.

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): **0.079 acres** linear feet, wide.
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:
- Wetlands: 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: **Garcia and Associates, 2010**
 - 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; NV-HIDDEN VALLEY**
 - 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: **Currently in review - SPK-2010-0252**
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Piute Wash is an A2 water the crosses the Nevada State line approximately 60.0 miles south of the project area. The washes associated with this form are those that were determined to have no direct or indirect connection with Piute Wash, and either terminated in upland before reaching Piute Wash, or lost the necessary features to be considered a tributary of Piute Wash (i.e. – defined bed and bank, continuous OHWM, lack of channel features, large areas of upland between Piute and isolated drainages). In summary, direct observations following a series of two back to back 2-year storm events indicate that the drainages listed in the table at the end of this form do not appear to have a direct hydrological connection to a TNW or RPW under ordinary conditions. Therefore, the Corps is declining jurisdiction over the following ephemeral drainages based on the lack of a significant nexus to the Colorado River. Based on the distance, soil characteristics, water quantity and field observations, it is unlikely that water from these drainage area have the opportunity or potential to affect water quality in the Colorado River.

Regulatory Action Type	Size	Local Waterway
SPK-2010-0576(NV-67) (ISOLATE)	0.006	Unnamed Tributary of Piute Wash
SPK-2010-0576(NV-74) (ISOLATE)	0.006	Unnamed Tributary of Piute Wash
SPK-2010-0576(NV-78) (ISOLATE)	0.007	Unnamed Tributary of Piute Wash
SPK-2010-0576(NV-82) (ISOLATE)	0.023	Unnamed Tributary of Piute Wash
SPK-2010-0576(NV-87) (ISOLATE)	0.01	Unnamed Tributary of Piute Wash
SPK-2010-0576(NV-91) (ISOLATE)	0.013	Unnamed Tributary of Piute Wash
SPK-2010-0576(NV-106) (ISOLATE)	0.014	Unnamed Tributary of Piute Wash
0.079		