

SUPPLEMENT TO THE DECISION DOCUMENT FOR NATIONWIDE PERMIT 17

This document is a supplement to the national decision document for Nationwide Permit (NWP) 17, and addresses the regional modifications and conditions for this NWP. The South Pacific Division Engineer has considered the potential cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment that could result from the use of this NWP, including the need for additional modifications of this NWP by the establishment of regional conditions to ensure that those cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment are minimal. The Division Engineer has also considered the exclusion of this NWP from certain geographic areas or specific waterbodies. These regional conditions are necessary to address important regional issues relating to the aquatic environment. These regional issues are identified in this document. These regional conditions are being required to ensure that this NWP authorizes activities that result in no more than minimal individual or cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment. This document also identifies regionally important high-value waters and other geographic areas in which this NWP should be regionally conditioned or excluded from NWP eligibility, as described below, to further ensure that the NWP does not authorize activities that may exceed the minimal adverse effects threshold.

Text of NWP 17:

Hydropower Projects. Discharges of dredged or fill material associated with hydropower projects having: (a) Less than 5000 kW of total generating capacity at existing reservoirs, where the project, including the fill, is licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) under the Federal Power Act of 1920, as amended; or (b) a licensing exemption granted by the FERC pursuant to Section 408 of the Energy Security Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2705 and 2708) and Section 30 of the Federal Power Act, as amended.

Notification: The permittee must submit a pre-construction notification (PCN) to the district engineer prior to commencing the activity. (See general condition 31.) (Section 404)

Summary of changes to NWP 17 from 2007:

There were no changes to NWP 17 from 2007

1.0 Background

In the February 16, 2011, issue of the Federal Register (76 FR 9174), the Corps of Engineers (Corps) published its proposal to reissue 48 existing NWPs and issue two new NWPs. To solicit comments on its proposed regional conditions for these NWPs, the Los Angeles District issued a public notice on February 25, 2011. The issuance of the NWPs was announced in the February 21, 2012, Federal Register notice (77 FR 10184). After the publication of the final NWPs, the Los Angeles District considered the need for regional conditions for this NWP. The Los Angeles District's findings are discussed below.

2.0 Consideration of Public Comments

2.1 General Comments

Please See the attached response to comments document (Section III)

2.2 Comments on Proposed Regional Conditions

2.2.1 Proposed Regional Condition 1

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.2 Proposed Regional Condition 2

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.3 Proposed Regional Condition 3

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.4 Proposed Regional Condition 4

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.5 Proposed Regional Condition 5

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.6 Proposed Regional Condition 6

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.7 Proposed Regional Condition 7

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.8 Proposed Regional Condition 8

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.9 Proposed Regional Condition 9

Please see the attached response to comments document.

2.2.10 Proposed Regional Condition 10

Please see the attached response to comments document.

3.0 Waters Excluded from NWP or Subject to Additional Pre-Construction Notification Requirements

3.1 Waters excluded from use of this NWP

3.1.1 Special Aquatic Sites in Arizona and Mojave and Sonoran Deserts of California (Regional Condition 2)

Reason for Exclusion: With this regional condition, NWPs 3, 7, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 35, 36, 39-46, and 48-52 may **not** be used to authorize the discharge of dredged or fill material into a jurisdictional special aquatic site in the State of Arizona and the Mojave and Sonoran desert regions in California, including wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows, and sanctuaries and refuges as defined in 40 CFR Part 230.40-45. The regional condition would require applicants to submit an application for a Standard Individual Permit subject to authorization under section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, section 103 of the Marine Protection, Resource and Sanctuaries Act, and/or section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Special aquatic sites in the desert regions of the Los Angeles District support substantial aquatic resources that exhibit relatively high physical and biological functions. Furthermore, these aquatic areas can provide important and unique habitat for endangered species, neotropical migratory birds, and other indigenous wildlife. Past construction activities in and adjacent to these special aquatic sites have degraded portions of these high value systems. Regional Condition 2 would ensure compliance with the 404(b)(1) guidelines and evaluation and mitigation, if warranted, of activities that may have an adverse effect on special aquatic sites in the otherwise arid regions of the Los Angeles District.

In the Los Angeles District, the semi-arid climate limits the extent and number of special aquatic sites. This scarcity of special aquatic sites is especially evident in Arizona and in the desert regions of California. In these areas, annual precipitation is usually below 10 inches, which precludes the development of wetlands in the majority of these desert regions. Furthermore, approximately 90 percent of wetlands in California have been affected by historic conversion to agricultural uses, grading, and filling activities. As a result, wetland areas are rare in the Los Angeles District and warrant more rigorous protection. Regional Condition 2 would serve to better protect special aquatic sites in desert regions of the Los Angeles District by requiring the additional scrutiny inherent in the Standard Individual Permit (SIP) process for most permanent discharges of dredged or fill material in these areas. The permit applicant would have to perform a 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis that would include careful examination of the purpose and need for the project and alternatives that avoid or reduce impacts to special aquatic sites. Regional Condition 2 would help ensure that discharges of dredged or fill material that would otherwise be authorized by NWPs would have minimal impacts, both individually cumulatively, to special aquatic sites in the Los Angeles District.

This regional condition has been amended from that included with the 2007 NWPs (Regional Condition 4) to clarify the definition of *desert regions of California* to include specific

watersheds as defined by USGS Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) accounting units. These include Lower Colorado (150301), Northern Mojave (180902), Southern Mojave (181001) and Salton Sea (181002). In addition, coral reefs and sanctuaries and refuges were removed from the list of special aquatic sites for which this regional condition would apply. Coral reefs were removed as they do not exist within the subject geographic area. Sanctuaries and refuges were removed as there are circumstances where a predominantly upland sanctuary or refuge may contain aquatic resources that exhibit relatively low physical and biological functions (such as a disturbed ephemeral drainage) yet nevertheless would be considered a special aquatic site. In those cases, mandatory notification (per regional condition 4a) would be sufficient to ensure a given project would have no more than minimal impacts by ensuring Corps review.

For additional information please see the supplemental decision document for Regional Condition 2.

3.1.2 Jurisdictional Vernal Pools (Regional Condition 5)

Reason for Exclusion: This regional condition would require any project proposing to discharge dredged or fill material into a jurisdictional vernal pool to be reviewed under the standard individual permit (SIP) process, which requires a more rigorous alternatives review. This regional condition has been amended from the 2007 version to include an exception for discharges associated with restoration, enhancement, management, or scientific study activities that qualify for NWPs 5, 6, and 27. NWPs 5 and 6 authorize temporary activities and structures that could be used to further the understanding of vernal pool functions and services or for monitoring the effectiveness of enhancement, restoration, and establishment projects. NWP 27 authorizes only activities that result in net increases in aquatic resource functions and services. Per this regional condition, authorization under other NWPs cannot be considered and a PCN must be submitted in accordance with General Condition 31 and Regional Condition 3. In discussions with local land managers, Regional Condition 5 has increased project costs and timelines in order to obtain an SIP for voluntary restoration and enhancement projects. This has also limited their ability to compete for grant and other public funding with restrictions on costs and timelines. Therefore, the Los Angeles District believes that by allowing the use of these three NWPs, the scientific community and open space land managers would benefit from the streamlined process and there may ultimately be a net increase in functions and services in vernal pool ecosystems through the implementation of restoration, enhancement, and management activities.

The Los Angeles District Regulatory Branch previously determined that the 0.5-acre SIP threshold for vernal pool impacts (established by the District in 1997) would not adequately protect remaining vernal pool resources in the region. It is estimated that 95 to more than 97 percent of the vernal pools that historically existed in the region have been lost through urbanization or agricultural practices (USFWS 1998); in some counties the loss is virtually total. Under the new and modified NWPs, a single and complete project could impact up to 0.5 acre of vernal pool habitat and be considered for NWP authorization. The District had previously been using a 0.5-acre SIP threshold for vernal pool impacts since 25 November 1997 (previous District Regional Condition 1). Despite the establishment of this earlier regional condition, the District experienced additional losses of vernal pool habitat, requiring the establishment of

Regional Condition 5 as part of the 2000, 2002 and 2007 NWP Programs. Within the boundaries of the Los Angeles District, the sizes of jurisdictional vernal pools generally range from approximately 200 to 4,900 square feet (e.g. 0.00459 to 0.11248 acre). Therefore, 0.5 acre of vernal pools could include a large vernal pool complex or individual pools made up of 5 to 100 pools. Compounding this situation, mitigation for vernal pool impacts is not well developed, and often takes the form of preservation and enhancement of remaining pools, resulting in a continued net loss of vernal pool acreage, functions and services. The SIP review process includes an analysis of the propriety of the proposed fill in a special aquatic site pursuant to the 404(b)(1) Guidelines.

Vernal pools in the region comprise a severely diminished class of aquatic habitats and are fragile, easily disturbed ecosystems. Due to the decline of vernal pool habitat in the region, the District determined future impacts to vernal pools in the region would result in more than minimal adverse environmental effects both individually and cumulatively. With the proposed regional condition, any quantity of dredged or fill material discharged into a jurisdictional vernal pool that is not temporary in accordance with NWP 5 or 6 or does not result in a net increase in aquatic resources functions and services in accordance with NWP 27 would be subject to an SIP review. By requiring an SIP, the remaining jurisdictional vernal pools in the region would be afforded the maximum level of protection under the Regulatory Program which includes a 404(b)(1) analysis (i.e., under this more rigorous process, the Corps can only authorize the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative for a given project).

With the modification of Regional Condition 5, the District recognizes certain regulated activities involving restoration, enhancement, management, and scientific study of vernal pools would not contribute to the overall loss of vernal pool habitat and in such cases (with few exceptions) SIP review would not provide any additional protection or benefit to vernal pools. Therefore, this regional condition has been modified since the 2007 NWPs to include language excluding these four categories of activities from this requirement. If the success of a proposed restoration or enhancement activity is uncertain, or the subject vernal pool is of particularly high ecological value, the District would still retain the ability to review any such action as an SIP through our discretionary authority. In addition, the Corps has determined that issuance of Regional Condition 5 would not be contrary to the public interest. Overall, the implementation of Regional Condition 5, which requires an SIP for discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools (with the exception of activities associated with the restoration, enhancement, management or scientific study), would provide additional assurances that the activities permitted under the NWPs would result in minimal impacts on both an individual and cumulative basis in the Los Angeles District.

For additional information please see the supplemental decision document for Regional Condition 5.

3.1.3 San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMPs (Regional Condition 8).

Reason for Exclusion: Regional Condition 8 would exclude the use of selected NWP authorizations within all jurisdictional waters of the San Diego Creek, San Juan Creek, and

western San Mateo Creek and their tributaries within three watersheds. This decision to revoke selected NWP's was made in accordance with two Special Area Management Plans (SAMPs) the Corps conducted in Orange County, and pursuant to the South Pacific Division (SPD) Commander's authority at 33 C.F.R. § 330.5(c).

Concurrent with establishing watershed-specific permitting frameworks, the following 24 NWP's are being revoked for use in these watersheds covered by the two SAMPs in Orange County: 03, 07, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 49, and 50. The remaining 26 NWP's would be retained for use in the watersheds covered by the two SAMPs in Orange County: 01, 02, 04, 05, 06, 08, 09, 10, 11, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 45, 48, 51 and 52.

The decision to revoke selected NWP's within these SAMP Watersheds involved establishing alternative permitting procedures determined to be more appropriate for the given aquatic resources in the watersheds, and promoting long-term aquatic resource conservation. This exclusion would require any project that involved a regulated activity within these particular watersheds to receive the level of permit review and evaluation in consideration of the applicable SAMP framework.

Specifically, the San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek Watersheds SAMP incorporated alternative permitting procedures consisting of the establishment of a Regional General Permit (RGP) 74 for maintenance activities for use outside the targeted aquatic resource conservation areas, new LOP procedures, and a long-term Standard Individual Permit (SIP) and LOP procedures for the SAMP participants. Similarly, the San Diego Creek Watershed SAMP incorporated alternative permitting procedures consisting of new LOP procedures and RGP 74. Regulated activities ineligible for retained NWP's or the SAMPs' alternative permitting procedures would be reviewed under the SIP process, which would include a 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis.

The Corps conducted extensive analyses in its environmental impact statement (EIS) for the San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek Watersheds SAMP and its joint EIS/environmental impact report (EIR) with the California Department of Fish and Game Habitat Conservation Branch, South Coast Region for the San Diego Creek Watershed SAMP/Watershed Streambed Alteration Agreement (WSAA) Process. The final decision to revoke selected NWP's was made by the SPD Commander in his record of decision signed July 19, 2010.

For additional information please see the supplemental decision document for Regional Condition 8.

3.2 Waters subjected to additional pre-construction notification requirements

Submission of a pre-construction notification (PCN) to the district engineer prior to commencing the activity is always required; therefore this section does not apply.

4.0 Alternatives

4.1 No Regional Conditions

Regional conditions are proposed that would impose specific requirements in design or exclude the use of NWP authorization in certain areas or aquatic resource types because of sensitivity or rarity. Without specific design requirements for road crossings in waters supporting threatened and endangered fish species, there could be more than minimal impacts to certain endangered species, such as southern steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Some aquatic habitat types are rare and sensitive; it is estimated that more than 95 percent of vernal pool habitat has been lost in the southern California area. Additional losses would have more than minimal impacts on this habitat type both individually and cumulatively. With no regional conditions, NWP 17 could be used to authorize discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows, and riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the Mojave and Sonoran (Colorado) desert regions of California. Given their relative rarity and sensitivity, hydropower projects could have more than minimal adverse effects to them on an individual or cumulative basis. Finally, the Los Angeles District has developed SAMPs in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek watersheds to establish alternative permitting procedures for certain resources to promote long-term aquatic resource conservation in these rapidly developing watersheds. Without a regional condition prohibiting use of NWP 17 in favor of alternative permitting procedures, there could be more than minimal cumulative impacts over the long term. Overall, with no regional conditions, NWP 17 could adversely affect sensitive aquatic resources in some areas in the Los Angeles District, unless the Corps and/or the resource agencies are able to individually review them to ascertain an appropriate level of analysis and mitigation.

4.2 Alternative Regional Limits or Pre-Construction Notification Thresholds

The terms and Conditions of NWP 17 require PCN for all projects that would utilize NWP 17. However, alternative regional limits could be proposed to further reduce the potential for impacts to special aquatic sites. In the Los Angeles District, the semi-arid climate limits special aquatic sites throughout the region. In dryland areas, lack of vegetation and developed soils result in high peak discharges for large storm events. With a predominance of deep alluvial soils, dryland systems are dominated by overland flow with groundwater recharge and throughflow only contributing a relatively small quantity to stream discharge. Over the past fifty years, agricultural and construction activities have resulted in a loss of approximately 90 percent of wetlands and 95 to more than 99 percent of the vernal pools in southern California. Further loss of special aquatic sites in southern California and Arizona could result in more than minimal cumulative impacts. To ensure any further impact to special aquatic sites, the Los Angeles District could regionally limit NWP 17 by prohibiting its use in all special aquatic sites. This alternative has been dismissed because applicable regional conditions already serve to limit the use of NWP 17 in certain regionally sensitive habitats. Furthermore, based on a review of past actions authorized under NWP 17 in the Los Angeles District, there is no indication that it has resulted in any substantial losses of special aquatic sites. With the PCN requirement, the District has the opportunity to review all potential NWP 17 projects, and can encourage avoidance and minimization, and if necessary offset adverse effects with compensatory mitigation.

While more restrictive regional limits could be developed for additional geographic areas, it could result in an adverse increase in workload in the Los Angeles District without commensurate benefits to the aquatic environment. As a result, this alternative regional limit has been dismissed from further consideration.

4.3 Alternative Regional Nationwide Permit Conditions

As proposed, NWP 17 would be excluded from use in wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows, and riffle and pool complexes in Arizona and the desert areas of southern California. Therefore, NWP 17 and other NWPs could be used to authorize impacts in special aquatic sites outside of these areas as long as they are not disallowed by other exclusions imposed by the general conditions (e.g., critical resource waters) and other regional conditions.

As an alternative regional condition, the Los Angeles District could include resource agency coordination for all projects that require authorization under NWP 17 following the procedures described in General Condition 31 (notification). The Los Angeles District could forward PCNs to USEPA, USFWS and other resource agencies for a 15-day review prior to verification. Requiring resource agency notification for all NWP 17 projects, including those not involving a special aquatic site or not exhibiting relatively high physical and biological functions, would substantially increase the workload for the Los Angeles District and cause delays in project verification without commensurate benefits to aquatic resources. Based on a review of past actions authorized under NWP 17 during the three-year period from fiscal year 2009 through 2011, the Los Angeles District authorized two actions under NWP 17, which resulted in a total of 0.05 acre of permanent impact to non-wetland waters. This trend of limited use and very minimal impacts to waters would be expected to continue during the 5-year period of NWP 17. NWP 17 would require notifying the Corps prior to each use, and if the Corps determines the proposed project's impacts would be more than minimal, the district engineer may take discretionary authority under 33 CFR 330.1(d) and require completing the more rigorous SIP process. Furthermore, under the notification requirements in General Condition 31, agency notification would be required for any use of NWP 17 that would result in the loss of greater than 0.5 acre of waters. As a result, the Los Angeles District has determined the above alternative notification requirements would not be practicable and would result in only minor additional benefits to aquatic resources.

In conclusion, the Los Angeles District has proposed regional conditions that would further ensure that NWP 17 does not authorize activities with more than minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment (See Section 2.0, above). With the proposed regional conditions, the Los Angeles District has identified resources and watersheds that warrant additional scrutiny under NWP 17. As a result, the District's proposed conditions would result in a relatively minor increase in overall workload, but would provide potentially substantial benefits to the aquatic environment in the identified areas. Additional regional conditions have not been proposed at this time because they would not provide added value for protection of the aquatic environment in consideration of the projected increase in the Los Angeles District's workload. Therefore, alternative regional nationwide permit conditions have been dismissed from further consideration.

5.0 Endangered Species Act

5.1 General Considerations

NWP 17 authorizes the discharge of fill material associated with hydropower projects having: (a) Less than 5000 kW of total generating capacity at existing reservoirs, where the project, including the fill, is licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) under the Federal Power Act of 1920, as amended; or (b) a licensing exemption granted by the FERC pursuant to Section 408 of the Energy Security Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2705 and 2708) and Section 30 of the Federal Power Act, as amended. This NWP does not have an acreage limit but does require notification to the District Engineer. In addition, the General and Regional Conditions would provide further limitations on the use of NWP 17 in sensitive aquatic ecosystems that may support threatened and endangered species including jurisdictional vernal pools, certain special aquatic sites in the State of Arizona and desert regions of California, and in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP areas. With these constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal adverse impacts to threatened and endangered species, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District. With no Regional Conditions for NWP 17, there could be more than minimal impacts only in specific geographic areas and certain habitat types that exhibit relatively high physical and biological functions. In addition, given the large number of listed species in Los Angeles District, continued coordination with USFWS and NMFS is required to ensure minimal impacts to endangered species. With the continuation of the existing informal coordination procedures, the development and implementation of SLOPES, and the inclusion of additional notification requirements, the use of NWP 17 would have minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively, to threatened and endangered species in the Los Angeles District.

In southern California, the large number of listed species has made the public more aware of the need to contact the USFWS and NMFS for many proposed projects. In addition, General Condition 18 requires the applicant to contact the Corps if their proposed project may affect a threatened or endangered species or critical habitat. The Los Angeles District has substantial information, including maps, previous studies and survey data that document areas that support endangered species. The District is also very careful to inform all prospective applicants of the need to comply with the ESA. If the District has no available data for a proposed project, the applicant may be referred to the USFWS or NMFS for additional information. When the District receives an application within the range of a listed species and/or the project area otherwise supports suitable habitat, the USFWS or NMFS is contacted early in the review process. To facilitate compliance with the ESA, the District has coordinated with the USFWS to complete programmatic consultations for several threatened and endangered species in Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo counties.

As proposed, the NWP general and regional conditions ensure that other federal statutory requirements are met. For example, in instances where a project may impact a federally listed species or its critical habitat, the applicant would be required to submit to the Corps appropriate biological investigations and supporting documentation for an “effects determination” with respect to the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Per General Condition 18, if the federal action were determined to have a potential effect on a federally listed species, or its designated critical

habitat, consultation would be required pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA. (It should be noted that the Los Angeles District would ensure all federal project activities authorized under the NWP's comply with the ESA and use of the NWP's shall be determined to have minimal impacts on threatened and endangered species in the Los Angeles District, pursuant with ESA).

5.2 Local Operating Procedures for Endangered Species

The Los Angeles District has various procedures for ensuring compliance with the ESA. SLOPES formalize additional procedures between agencies to enable the agencies to ensure better compliance with the ESA. With the implementation of SLOPES, these procedures could be formally documented, facilitating the compliance the NWP's with the ESA. It is anticipated there will be many situations that will not be addressed by SLOPES and a case-by-case determination will be made regarding consultation with the USFWS or NMFS pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA. In January 2003, the Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Regulatory Branch and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ventura Office finalized SLOPES for informal and formal ESA consultations. In addition, some the activities authorized by the NWP's that may adversely affect Essential Fish Habitat have been addressed by the General Concurrence dated August 5, 2003 and a Programmatic Consultation that was completed by the Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Regulatory Branch and NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service. The District has completed conducted several preliminary meetings with USFWS and NMFS staff to determine the direction of further SLOPES discussions, and additional meetings will be conducted in the future.

As proposed, the NWP general and regional conditions ensure that other federal statutory requirements are met. For example, in instances where a project may impact a federally listed species or its critical habitat, the applicant would be required to submit to the Corps appropriate biological investigations and supporting documentation for an "effects determination" with respect to the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Per General Condition 18, if the Federal Action were determined to have a potential effect on a federally listed species, or its designated critical habitat, consultation would be required pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA. (It should be noted that the Los Angeles District would ensure all federal project activities authorized under the NWP's comply with the ESA and use of the NWP's shall be determined to have minimal impacts on threatened and endangered species in the Los Angeles District, pursuant to the ESA).

6.0 National Historic Preservation Act

6.1 General Considerations

The Los Angeles District would ensure that activities authorized by NWP 14 would comply with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The District would review the latest version of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) to make an effect determination that activities verified under NWP 14 would have on Historic Properties. Once an effects determination has been made the District will coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), recognized Tribes, and, if necessary, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) as appropriate. The District has considered the requirement of pre-construction notification for NWP activities in geographic areas of high site

potential, or known locations of cultural resources including prehistoric sites, historic sites, tribal lands, traditional cultural properties, state landmarks or National Historic Landmarks. In areas where there is a high likelihood of cultural resources within the Corps' area of potential effect (APE), the district engineer may: (1) consult with SHPO, THPO, or Tribes during the NWP review process or (2) the district engineer may assert its discretionary authority to require an individual permit for the proposed activity and initiate consultation through the individual permit process. Option 2 would only be used if there is value added that compensates for the increase in workload due to processing more SIPs. If the consultation would be conducted under the NWP process without the district asserting discretionary authority to require an SIP, then the applicant would be notified that the activity could not be verified under the NWP until all Section 106 requirements have been satisfied.

6.2 Local Operating Procedures for National Historic Preservation Act

The district engineer would ensure that NWP 14 complies with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulation 36 C.F.R. Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties (amended August 5, 2004), and Appendix C (33 U.S.C. 325): Procedures of Historic Properties. Under section 106, federal agencies are prohibited from approving any federal "undertaking" (e.g., the issuance of any license, permit, or approval) without taking into account the effects of the undertaking on the historic properties, and affording the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking. In order to comply with section 106, the Corps, if evaluating an undertaking, must go through the process outlined in the ACHP's regulations at 36 C.F.R. Part 800 and Appendix C. Pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.4, 800.5, and 800.6, the Los Angeles District is required to consult with the SHPO, or tribal equivalent, THPO, if the undertaking would result in a "No Effect", "No Adverse Effect", or "Adverse Effect" to Historic Properties. The district engineer must (a) determine the permit area/ APE; (b) identify historic properties within the permit area/APE; and (c) determine whether those properties are listed or eligible for listing in the NRHP. If the district engineer determines that NWP 14 would have no potential to cause effects to Historic Properties a memorandum for the record would be prepared and no further consultation with the SHPO/THPO or recognized tribes would need to occur.

7.0 Government-to-Government Consultation with Indian Tribes

7.1 Summary of the Consultation Process

Prior to the issuance of the Los Angeles District's public notice announcing the proposed rule for the 2012 NWPs and our proposed regional conditions, all federally recognized tribes within Los Angeles District were contacted via letter dated December 13, 2010 to provide advance notification of the Corps' intent to issue the 2012 NWPs and upcoming opportunity to engage in government-to-government consultation. Follow-up letters were sent to the same set of federally recognized tribes February 11, 2011 announcing the issuance of the proposed rule and formally requesting government-to-government consultation. An advance copy of the proposed rule was also included. One tribe provided a response, indicating they did not foresee a need to utilize the NWPs. No requests for government-to-government consultation were received.

7.2 Local Operating Procedures for Protecting Tribal Resources

The Los Angeles District will avoid or minimize adverse effects to tribal lands, historic properties, sacred sites, or trust resources. This may involve identifying categories of activities that require pre-construction notification and/or conducting consultation with Tribes for specific activities in a particular geographic area. If coordination with recognized tribes is required the District Engineer will obtain a list of recognized tribes from the Native American Heritage Commission. From that list provided the District Engineer will initiate a 30-day coordination period to obtain comments on the project. The District Engineer will review comments and address as appropriate.

8.0 Essential Fish Habitat

Pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act, Federal agencies are required to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for actions that may adversely affect essential fish habitat (EFH). The marine and estuarine waters within the Los Angeles District contain designated EFH, which are administered by four fishery management plans (FMP): the Pacific Groundfish FMP, the Highly Migratory Species FMP, the Pacific Coast Salmon FMP, and the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP. The Los Angeles District's Regional Condition 4b requires submission of a PCN for any NWP authorization in EFH. A similar PCN requirement has been in place since the issuance of the 2002 NWPs. The current proposed regional condition includes the additional requirement that applicants include an EFH assessment with the PCN. By requiring a PCN with an EFH assessment for all activities within designated EFH, the Los Angeles District ensures the appropriate level of consultation with NMFS is conducted and effects to EFH are adequately addressed prior to verification.

To facilitate the consultation process, the Los Angeles District has developed an EFH general concurrence with Southwest Region of the NMFS. The general concurrence establishes a coordination procedure between NMFS and the Los Angeles District and covers a variety of Corps-regulated activities with minimal and/or temporary adverse effects to EFH. In addition, the Los Angeles District has developed a programmatic consultation with the Southwest Region of the NMFS that covers a broader range of activities that do not fit within the scope of the general concurrence. In summary, the inclusion of Regional Condition 4b, in conjunction with Los Angeles District's well-established set of procedures for addressing the effects of regulated activities within EFH (including conducting coordination with the NMFS as appropriate) will ensure the effects to EFH from the implementation of the 2012 NWPs will be minimal.

9.0 Supplement to National Impact Analysis

9.1 Public interest review factors (33 CFR 320.4(a)(1))

In addition to the discussion in the national decision document for this NWP, the Los Angeles District has considered the local impacts expected to result from the activities authorized by this NWP, including the reasonably foreseeable cumulative effects of those activities.

(a) Conservation: The General Conditions provide further limitations on the use of NWP 17 in waters of the U.S. Due to the above constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal impacts to conservation, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District. Regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District, in certain special aquatic sites in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California, and in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP areas. With the inclusion of mandatory notification requirements for NWP 17, long-term minor impacts to conservation in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced.

(b) Economics: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(c) Aesthetics: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(d) General environmental concerns: In the Los Angeles District, numerous threatened or endangered species require extensive coordination with USFWS and NMFS. The semi-arid environment limits the extent of aquatic resources in the southern California/Arizona area. Regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools in specific regions and special aquatic sites in Arizona and the desert regions of California. With the inclusion of the notification requirements for NWP 17 in special aquatic sites and sensitive watersheds and other aquatic resources, adverse effects on general environmental concerns in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced.

(e) Wetlands: In the Los Angeles District, the semi-arid climate limits the extent and number of wetland resources. This scarcity of wetlands is especially evident in Arizona and in the desert regions of California. In these areas, annual precipitation is usually below 10 inches, which often precludes the development of wetlands. As a result, special aquatic sites, such as wetlands, are relatively rare in the Los Angeles District and warrant more substantial protection. To ensure minimal impacts to wetland resources, the Los Angeles District would preclude the use of several NWPs, including NWP 17, in wetlands within desert regions in southern California and all of Arizona. With the inclusion of this modification along with the mandatory PCN requirement, NWP 17 would have long-term minor impacts, both individually and cumulatively, to wetland resources in the Los Angeles District. Impact and mitigation data was collected for the period of Fiscal Year 2009 through 2011 to provide a reasonable basis to examine the cumulative effects of each NWP as well as the NWP Program as a whole within the Los Angeles District. Based on an analysis of the types of activities authorized by the Los Angeles District during this period, the Los Angeles District authorized 2 actions under NWP 17, neither of which impacted wetlands. Based on the infrequent use of NWP 17 and the fact that it is typically utilized in non-wetland waters, this trend would be expected to continue through the 5-year term of NWP 17.

(f) Historic properties: Many known and unknown historic properties and cultural resources occur in many areas of the Los Angeles District. Many of them are adjacent to watercourses or other aquatic resources, and as such, may be affected by projects proposed for authorization under NWP 17. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires any federal action agency to determine the eligibility of any known or discovered cultural resources that may

be affected by the agency's action, and coordinate with the SHPO/THPO as appropriate. Because projects that may potentially be authorized under NWP 17 are brought to the attention of the Corps only when there is a specific project proposed, and because the project's relationship to the cultural resource may not be known until appropriate surveys are conducted, greater specificity cannot be determined at this time; however, through coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer and the implementation of mitigation measures, the Corps would ensure that NWP 17 would result in minimal impacts to historic properties.

(g) Fish and wildlife values: The General Conditions would provide limitations on the use of NWP 17 in waters of the U.S. Due to these constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal impacts to fish and wildlife values, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District. Regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District; in wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows and riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California; and in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP areas. With the inclusion of the mandatory PCN requirements for NWP 17 for all projects, the above long-term minor impacts to fish and wildlife values in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced.

(h) Flood hazards: With the dynamic storm season typical of southern California and parts of Arizona, large floods are a normal part of the hydrologic regime. Due to a general lack of soil development and vegetation coverage in semi-arid areas, peak discharges for very high magnitude storm events are potentially larger for dryland basins than similar-sized humid region basins.

(i) Floodplain values: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(j) Land use: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(k) Navigation: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(l) Shore erosion and accretion: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(m) Recreation: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(n) Water supply and conservation: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(o) Water quality: In the heavily populated areas of southern California and Arizona, existing water quality in most rivers is impaired by runoff from upland agricultural, residential and industrial sources. The General Conditions would provide further limitations on the use of NWP 17 in waters of the U.S. Due to the above constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal adverse impacts to water quality, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District. Regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District; in wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows and riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California; and in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP

areas. With the inclusion of mandatory PCN requirements for NWP 17, the above long-term minor impacts to water quality in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced.

(p) Energy needs: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(q) Safety: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(r) Food and fiber production: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(s) Mineral needs: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(t) Considerations of property ownership: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

9.2 National Environmental Policy Act Cumulative Effects Analysis (40 CFR 1508.7)

Please see the attached supplemental analysis (Section I), and the 404(b)(1) guidelines cumulative effects analysis (Section 9.4), below.

9.3 Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines Impact Analysis (Subparts C-F)

(a) Substrate: With NWP 17, there would short-term adverse impacts to channel substrate in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir facilities. The new General Conditions have additional limitations on the use of NWP 17 in waters of the U.S and the above regional conditions provide additional restrictions for the use of NWP 17 in sensitive aquatic resources. Due to the above constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal adverse impacts to substrate, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District.

With no regional conditions for NWP 17, there would be more than minimal impacts only in specific geographic areas and certain habitat types that exhibit relatively high physical and biological functions. The regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District; in wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows and riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California; and in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP areas. With the inclusion of the mandatory PCN requirements for NWP 17 in all cases, the above long-term minor impacts to channel substrate in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced and would result in long-term minor impacts to channel substrate.

(b) Suspended particulates/turbidity: In heavily populated areas of southern California and Arizona, existing turbidity levels in most rivers has been exacerbated by runoff from upland agricultural, residential and industrial sources. Short-term construction activities often augment turbidity levels in waters of the U.S. However, these activities would generally only result in short-term minor changes in turbidity levels. The General Conditions have additional limitations on the use of NWP 17 in waters of the U.S. Due to the above constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal adverse impacts to turbidity levels, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District.

With no regional conditions for NWP 17, there would be more than minimal impacts only in specific geographic areas and certain habitat types that exhibit relatively high physical and biological functions. The regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District; in wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows and riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California; and in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP areas. With the inclusion of the mandatory PCN requirement for NWP 17 in all cases, the above long-term minor impacts to suspended sediment levels in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced. In addition, the required 401 certification would also address short-term and long-term minimal impacts to turbidity and suspended sediment loads in the rivers and streams in the Los Angeles District. With the implementation of the above measures, NWP 17 would have long-term minor impacts to turbidity levels in waters of the U.S. within the Los Angeles District.

(c) Water: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(d) Current patterns and water circulation: Hydropower facilities are placed directly within a particular watercourse. This has a direct and tangible effect on riparian hydraulics, particularly attenuation of peak flows and selective metering of flows from the constructed basin. In the coastal watersheds of the Los Angeles District, impacts to currents and water circulation could affect spawning of southern steelhead. As a result, any construction activities associated with hydropower facilities could adversely affect spawning habitat for any listed species. To ensure minimal impacts to steelhead or other listed aquatic species, Regional Condition 1 would require all bridge crossing to adhere to a design standard that does not hinder steelhead migration, rearing or spawning. Furthermore, the terms and conditions of NWP 17 include a mandatory PCN requirement, which would enable the Los Angeles District to evaluate these potential effects and conduct consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA if needed. The PCN requirement would also enable the Los Angeles District to address other potential adverse effects on current patterns and water circulation. With the inclusion of the above provisions, NWP 17 would have long-term minor impacts to current patterns and circulation in waters of the U.S in the Los Angeles District.

(e) Normal water level fluctuations: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(f) Salinity gradients: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(g) Threatened and endangered species: The General Conditions have additional limitations on the use of NWP 17 in waters of the U.S. Due to the above constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal adverse impacts to threatened and endangered species, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District. With no regional conditions for NWP 17, there would be more than minimal impacts only in specific geographic areas and certain habitat types that exhibit relatively high physical and biological functions and are known to contain habitat for threatened and endangered species. The regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District; in wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows and riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California; and in the San Diego

Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP areas. With the continuation of the existing informal coordination procedures, the development and implementation of Standard Local Operating Procedures for Endangered Species (SLOPES), and the inclusion of mandatory notification requirements, the use of NWP 17 would have minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively, to threatened and endangered species in the Los Angeles District. ESA coordination data was collected for the period of Fiscal Year 2009 through 2011 to provide a reasonable basis to examine the cumulative effects of each NWP as well as the NWP Program as a whole within the Los Angeles District. Based on an analysis of the types of activities authorized by the Los Angeles District during this period, the Los Angeles District did not conduct any ESA coordination associated with this NWP.

(h) Fish, crustaceans, molluscs, and other aquatic organisms in the food web: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(i) Other wildlife: In the semi-arid southern California climate, rivers and streams and their associated riparian habitat represent an important resource for wildlife. The General Conditions have additional limitations on the use of NWP 17 in waters of the U.S. Due to the above constraints, NWP 17 would result in minimal adverse impacts to wildlife, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District. With no regional conditions for NWP 17, there would be more than minimal impacts only in specific geographic areas and certain habitat types that exhibit relatively high physical and biological functions. The regional conditions for NWP 17 preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District; in wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows and riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California; and in the San Diego Creek and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek SAMP areas. With the inclusion of the mandatory PCN requirement for NWP 17, the above long-term minor impacts to wildlife in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced, resulting in minor cumulative impacts.

(j) Special aquatic sites: Impact and mitigation data was collected for the period of Fiscal Year 2009 through 2011 to provide a reasonable basis to examine the cumulative effects of each NWP as well as the NWP Program as a whole within the Los Angeles District. Based on an analysis of the types of activities authorized by the Los Angeles District during this period, the Los Angeles District estimates that this NWP resulting in permanent impacts to less than 0.05 acre of non-wetland waters of the United States on an annual basis, and no impacts to special aquatic sites. The potential impacts to specific special aquatic sites are further discussed below:

(1) Sanctuaries and refuges: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(2) Wetlands: In the Los Angeles District, the semi-arid climate limits the extent and number of wetland resources. This scarcity of wetlands is especially evident in Arizona and in the desert regions of California. In these areas, annual precipitation is usually below 10 inches, which precludes the development of wetlands in the majority of these desert regions. Furthermore, approximately 90 percent of wetlands in California have been affected by historic conversion to agricultural uses, grading and filling activities. As a result, wetland areas are rare in the Los Angeles District and warrant more rigorous protection. To ensure minimal impacts to wetland resources, the Los Angeles District

would require notification for any activity discharging dredged or fill material in any special aquatic site, including wetlands. The regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools throughout the Los Angeles District and in wetlands in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California. With the inclusion of mandatory PCN requirements for NWP 17, there would be only long-term minor impacts to wetlands in the Los Angeles District.

(3) Mud flats: In the Los Angeles District, historic coastal development activities have greatly reduced the extent and number of mudflat resources. Approximately 90 percent of wetlands, including coastal wetlands and mudflats, in California have been affected by historic conversion to agricultural uses, grading and filling activities. As a result, mudflats are especially rare in the Los Angeles District and warrant more rigorous protection. To ensure minimal impacts to mudflats, the Los Angeles District would preclude use of NWP 17 in any mudflat within the State of Arizona and desert regions of California. In addition, the terms and conditions of NWP 17 include a mandatory PCN requirement. With the inclusion of these conditions, NWP 17 would have long-term minor impacts to mudflats in the Los Angeles District.

(4) Vegetated shallows: In the Los Angeles District, historic agricultural and construction activities have reduced the extent and number of vegetated shallows. Approximately 90 percent of wetlands in California, including some vegetated shallows, have been affected by historic conversion to agricultural uses, grading, and filling activities, such as marina construction. As a result, vegetated shallows are especially rare in the Los Angeles District and warrant more rigorous protection. To ensure minimal impacts to vegetated shallows, the regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in vegetated shallows in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California. With the inclusion of these modifications, and the mandatory PCN requirement, NWP 17 would have minimal impacts on vegetated shallows in the Los Angeles District.

(5) Coral reefs: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(6) Riffle and pool complexes: In the semi-arid southern California and Arizona areas, limited water resources and the need for flood control have led to the construction of numerous dams in the mountains of southern California and Arizona, and on the Colorado River. With the construction of these large dams, many riffle and pool complexes have been eliminated by the large reservoirs. Furthermore, construction of the dams also modifies the hydrologic regime of the river, which can also degrade downstream riffle and pool complexes. As a result, riffle and pool complexes in the Los Angeles District are essentially confined to montane and foothill regions. They warrant more rigorous protection due to their relatively high production of invertebrate fauna and other contributions to riparian aquatic resources such as aeration of the water, provision of substrate for decomposers, and other factors. To ensure minimal impacts to riffle and pool complexes, the regional conditions for NWP 17 would preclude discharges of dredged or fill material in riffle and pool complexes in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California. With the inclusion of these modifications and the mandatory PCN

requirement, NWP 17 would have long-term minimal impacts to riffle and pool complexes in the Los Angeles District.

(k) Municipal and private water supplies: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(l) Recreational and commercial fisheries: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(m) Water-related recreation: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(n) Aesthetics: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(o) Parks, national and historical monuments, national seashores, wilderness areas, research sites, and similar areas: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

9.4 Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines Cumulative Effects Analysis (40 CFR 230.7(b)(3))

The cumulative effects of this NWP on the aquatic environment are dependent upon the number of times the NWP is used and the quantity and quality of waters of the United States lost due to the activities authorized by this NWP. Impacts to aquatic resources authorized by the Los Angeles District's permit actions are tracked using the ORM (OMBIL Regulatory Module) database. This includes both temporary and permanent impacts, as well as any compensatory mitigation required. Impact and mitigation data was collected for the period of Fiscal Year 2009 through 2011 to provide a reasonable basis to examine the cumulative effects of each NWP as well as the NWP Program as a whole within the Los Angeles District.

Based on an analysis of the types of activities authorized by the Los Angeles District during this period, the Los Angeles District estimates that this NWP will be used approximately 1 times per year, resulting the loss of approximately 0.04 acres of waters of the United States on an annual basis. Due to the less than minimal adverse effect on the aquatic environment, individually and cumulatively resulting from these projects, no compensatory mitigation was required. Because of the infrequent use of NWP 17 in the Los Angeles District (2 times in the 3-year period of review), it is difficult to provide specific projections on its use during its 5-year span. Based on the available information it is likely NWP 17 will continue to be used very infrequently and only result in very minor impacts to the aquatic environment, both on an individual and cumulative basis.

10.0 List of Final Corps Regional Conditions for NWP 17

10.1 Regional condition 1

For all activities in waters of the U.S. that are suitable habitat for Federally-listed fish species, the permittee shall design all road crossings to ensure that the passage and/or spawning of fish is not hindered. In these areas, the permittee shall employ bridge designs that span the stream or river, including pier- or pile-supported spans, or designs that use a bottomless arch culvert with a natural stream bed, unless determined to be impracticable by the Corps.

10.2 Regional condition 2

Nationwide Permits (NWP) 3, 7, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 35, 36, or 39-46, 48-52 cannot be used to authorize structures, work, and/or the discharge of dredged or fill material that would result in the "loss" of wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows or riffle and pool complexes as defined at 40 CFR Part 230.40-45. The definition of "loss" for this regional condition is the same as the definition of "loss of waters of the United States" used for the Nationwide Permit Program. Furthermore, this regional condition applies only within the State of Arizona and within the Mojave and Sonoran (Colorado) desert regions of California. The desert regions in California are limited to four USGS Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) accounting units (Lower Colorado -150301, Northern Mojave-180902, Southern Mojave-181001, and Salton Sea-181002).

10.3 Regional condition 3

When a pre-construction notification (PCN) is required, the appropriate U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) District shall be notified in accordance with General Condition 31 using either the South Pacific Division PCN Checklist or a signed application form (ENG Form 4345) with an attachment providing information on compliance with all of the General and Regional Conditions. The PCN Checklist and application form are available at:

<http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/regulatory>. In addition, the PCN shall include:

- a. A written statement describing how the activity has been designed to avoid and minimize adverse effects, both temporary and permanent, to waters of the United States;
- b. Drawings, including plan and cross-section views, clearly depicting the location, size and dimensions of the proposed activity as well as the location of delineated waters of the U.S. on the site. The drawings shall contain a title block, legend and scale, amount (in cubic yards) and area (in acres) of fill in Corps jurisdiction, including both permanent and temporary fills/structures. The ordinary high water mark or, if tidal waters, the mean high water mark and high tide line, should be shown (in feet), based on National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD) or other appropriate referenced elevation. All drawings for projects located within the boundaries of the Los Angeles District shall comply with the most current version of the *Map and Drawing Standards for the Los Angeles District Regulatory Division* (available on the Los Angeles District Regulatory Division website at: www.spl.usace.army.mil/regulatory/); and
- c. Numbered and dated pre-project color photographs showing a representative sample of waters proposed to be impacted on the project site, and all waters proposed to be avoided on and immediately adjacent to the project site. The compass angle and position of each photograph shall be documented on the plan-view drawing required in subpart b of this regional condition.

10.4 Regional condition 5

Individual Permits shall be required for all discharges of fill material in jurisdictional vernal pools, with the exception that discharges for the purpose of restoration, enhancement, management or scientific study of vernal pools may be authorized under NWP 5, 6, and 27 with the submission of a PCN in accordance with General Condition 31 and Regional Condition 3.

10.5 Regional condition 8

In conjunction with the Los Angeles District's Special Area Management Plans (SAMPs) for the San Diego Creek Watershed and San Juan Creek/Western San Mateo Creek Watersheds in Orange County, California, the Corps' Division Engineer, through his discretionary authority has revoked the use of the following 24 selected NWPs within these SAMP watersheds: 03, 07, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 49 and 50. Consequently, these NWPs are no longer available in those watersheds to authorize impacts to waters of the United States from discharges of dredged or fill material under the Corps' Clean Water Act section 404 authority.

10.6 Regional condition 10

The permittee shall complete the construction of any compensatory mitigation required by special condition(s) of the NWP verification before or concurrent with commencement of construction of the authorized activity, except when specifically determined to be impracticable by the Corps. When mitigation involves use of a mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program, the permittee shall submit proof of payment to the Corps prior to commencement of construction of the authorized activity.

11.0 Water Quality Certification and Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determinations

Pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), tribal or state Water Quality Certification, or waiver thereof, is required for activities authorized by NWPs that may result in a discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S. In addition, any state with a federally-approved Coastal Zone Management (CZM) plan must concur with the Corps determination that activities authorized by NWPs that are either within the state's coastal zone, or will affect any land or water uses, or natural resources within the state's coastal zone, are consistent with the CZM plan. In accordance with Corps regulations at 33 CFR 330.5 (c) and (d), any state 401/CZM conditions for a particular NWP become regional conditions for that NWP. The Corps recognizes that in some tribes or states there will be a need to add regional conditions, or for individual tribal or state review for some activities to ensure compliance with water quality standards or consistency with CZM plans.

The Los Angeles District announced the proposal to reissue the Nationwide Permits and our proposed regional conditions in a Special Public Notice dated February 25, 2011. The Los Angeles District also sent letters dated March 9, 2011 to the seven federally recognized tribes within the Los Angeles District (Big Pine Tribe, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai

Tribe, Navajo Nation, White Mountain Apache Tribe, and Twenty-nine Palms Band of Mission Indians) and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality announcing the proposed rule and our proposed regional conditions, and requesting the State of Arizona and each tribe review the information for purposes of providing water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Similarly, acting on behalf of the three Corps Districts in California the Sacramento District provided the same letter on February 23, 2011 to the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and EPA requesting 401 certification in the State of California and tribal lands within EPA Region 9, respectively (excluding those tribes with delegated 401 authority). The San Francisco District provided a letter to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) on behalf of both coastal districts in California on March 3, 2011, requesting Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) consistency certification. Additional discussions were held among the three Corps Districts in California and the SWRCB in an effort to strategize options for certifying a broader range of NWP or NWP-eligible activities than under the 2007 NWPs.

Upon publication of the final rule in the February 21, 2012, issue of the Federal Register (77 FR 10184), the Los Angeles District again provided letters to each of the seven tribes with 401 authority, and the State of Arizona requesting final 401 certification of the 2012 NWPs within their respective geographic areas of responsibility. Copies of the final regional conditions for the Los Angeles District were also provided. Similarly, the Los Angeles District provided a letter to the CCC on behalf of both coastal districts in California requesting final CZMA consistency certification of the 2012 NWPs and the respective regional conditions (copies of the letters are provided in Section IV). Each tribe and the State of Arizona have 60 days to issue, waive or deny certification for any or all of the 2012 NWPs. The CCC has 90 days to make their final determination. Due to the fact that the final rule was published on February 21, 2012, there is not sufficient time to allow the full 60- or 90-day review period before the 2012 NWPs are scheduled to go into effect on March 19, 2012. Therefore, the final outcome of 401 and CZMA certification within in the Los Angeles District is uncertain. Individual certifications will be required for any action authorized under the 2012 NWPs where applicable (i.e. projects within or affecting the Coastal Zone and/or projects that may affect water quality) until final determinations are provided by the respective state/tribal authorities.

The Los Angeles District believes, in general, that these NWPs and our regional conditions comply with State Water Quality Certification standards and are consistent with the Coastal Zone Management Plans.

12.0 Measures to Ensure Minimal Adverse Environmental Effects

The terms and conditions of the NWP, including the pre-construction notification requirements and the regional conditions listed in Section 10.0 of this document, will ensure that this NWP authorizes only activities with minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment. High value waters will be protected by the restrictions in general condition 22, the regional conditions discussed in this document, and the pre-construction notification requirements of the NWP. Through the pre-construction notification process, the Los Angeles District will review certain activities on a case-by-case basis to ensure that those activities result in minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually and cumulatively. As a

result of this review, the district engineer can add special conditions to an NWP authorization to ensure that the activity results in minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually and cumulatively. During the pre-construction notification process, the district engineer will exercise discretionary authority and require an individual permit for those activities that result in more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment.

If, at a later time, there is clear, unequivocal evidence that use of the NWP would result in more than minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually or cumulatively, the modification, suspension, or revocation procedures at 33 CFR 330.4(e) or 33 CFR 330.5 will be used.

13.0 Final Determination

Based on the considerations discussed above, and in accordance with 33 CFR 330.4(e)(1) and 330.5(c), I have determined that this NWP, including its terms and conditions, all regional conditions, and limitations, will authorize only those activities with minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually or cumulatively.