

SUPPLEMENT TO THE DECISION DOCUMENT FOR NATIONWIDE PERMIT 24

This document is a supplement to the national decision document for Nationwide Permit (NWP) 24, 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 24:

Indian Tribe or State Administered Section 404 Programs. Any activity permitted by a state or Indian Tribe administering its own section 404 permit program pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1344(g)-(1) is permitted pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. (Section 10)

Note 1: As of the date of the promulgation of this NWP, only New Jersey and Michigan administer their own section 404 permit programs.

Note 2: Those activities that do not involve an Indian Tribe or State section 404 permit are not included in this NWP, but certain structures will be exempted by Section 154 of Pub. L. 94-587, 90 Stat. 2917 (33 U.S.C. 591) (see 33 CFR 322.4(b)).

Summary of changes to NWP 24 from 2007:

This NWP is reissued without change.

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

3.1.2 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.

3.2 Waters subjected to additional pre-construction notification requirements

3.2.1 All Perennial Waters and Special Aquatic Sites in Arizona and Desert Regions of California (Regional Condition 4a)

Reason for Pre-Construction Notification Requirement: It is the position of the Los Angeles District that any discharges of dredged or fill material in a special aquatic site or a perennial water body in a desert area (excluding two reaches in the Colorado River) warrants the review of

Regulatory Division. The loss of approximately 90% of wetland resources in southern California and the general scarcity of special aquatic sites in this semi-arid region indicate the need for compensatory mitigation to ensure adverse impacts to special aquatic sites are no more than minimal individually and cumulatively. Special aquatic sites in Los Angeles District support substantial aquatic resources exhibiting relatively high physical and biological functions. Furthermore, these aquatic areas can provide important and unique habitat for endangered species, migratory birds, and other wildlife. In addition, past construction activities in and adjacent to these special aquatic sites have degraded portions of these high value systems.

Two relatively small reaches of the Colorado River have been excluded from this regional condition because these areas exhibit relatively low physical and biological functions; however, due to a large amount of existing infrastructure and ongoing recreational activities, there are a large number of small structures and minor projects that require authorization pursuant to section 10 of the RHA and/or section 404 of the CWA. As a result, requiring notification in the above two reaches of the Colorado River would increase the District's workload substantially while only providing minimal environmental benefits. With this notification requirement, the Los Angeles District can ensure that the use of the NWP for activities proposed within the special aquatic sites would have minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively. Activities sited within special aquatic sites that are determined to have the potential to exceed the minor impact threshold would be subject to review under the SIP process that requires a rigorous alternatives analysis. As such, further impacts to the special aquatic sites and perennial water bodies in desert areas would be avoided and minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Through the mandatory pre-construction notification process, the Los Angeles District will review the proposed discharges of dredged or fill material into special aquatic sites and perennial streams in desert areas (excluding the above two reaches in the Colorado River) on a case-by-case basis to ensure that those activities would result in minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually and cumulatively. 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).

For additional information please see the supplemental decision document for Regional Condition 4a.

3.2.2 All areas designated as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) in the Los Angeles District (Regional Condition 4b)

Reason for Pre-Construction Notification Requirement: The EFH regional condition has been developed to ensure compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA), as amended. The 2007 NWPs included Regional Condition 5, which required notification for any project located in EFH. Regional Condition 4b would replace Regional Condition 5 and include the additional requirement to include an EFH assessment as part of the notification package. The EFH mandates of the MSFCMA are to integrate fisheries management and habitat management by stressing the ecological relationships between fishery

resources and the environments upon which they depend, and ensure a consultation process by which federal agencies explicitly consider the effects of their actions on important habitats, with the goal of supporting the sustainable management of marine fisheries. The consultation process for any Federal project or action that may adversely affect EFH requires submission of an EFH assessment to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The inclusion of the requirement for applications to provide an EFH assessment places the burden of preparing the assessment on the permit applicant rather than the Corps, however, the Corps has generally relied on permit applicants to provide this information to meet the requirements of the consultation process associated with the permit action. Therefore, the Los Angeles District does not believe this will create an unduly burdensome requirement on permit applicants relative to current procedures. Regional Condition 4b also includes a link to sample EFH assessments provided by NMFS.

For additional information please see the supplemental decision document for Regional Condition 4b.

3.2.3 Projects located in all watersheds in the Santa Monica Mountains (Regional Condition 4c)

Reason for Pre-Construction Notification Requirement: The Santa Monica Mountains represent an important cultural and natural resource. The region contains a variety of protected areas, and serves as a recreation destination for Los Angeles area residents. Aquatic resources in the Santa Monica Mountains are important in the regional context and are also a center of native biodiversity. Despite their ecological importance, aquatic resources in the Santa Monica Mountains have experienced heavy losses. The Corps' ongoing study of cumulative impacts in the Malibu Creek watershed, the region's largest drainage basin, indicates that most of these impacts have occurred without Corps authorization (Lilien 2001¹). The Santa Monica Mountains have high natural resource values that contain 1066 hectares of aquatic habitat and support a number of federally listed threatened and endangered species. As documented in Lilien 2001, despite their importance, aquatic ecosystems in the Santa Monica Mountains, particularly Malibu Creek, have experienced loss and degradation of riparian habitat and, as a result, this regional condition is required to ensure that the NWP's would have minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively, to aquatic and riparian habitat in various watersheds in the Santa Monica Mountains.

For additional information please see the supplemental decision document for Regional Condition 4c.

3.2.4 Projects located in the Santa Clara River watershed (Regional Condition 4d)

Reason for Pre-Construction Notification Requirement: The entire Santa Clara River watershed encompasses approximately 1,634 square miles in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (the upper watershed, which includes 45 miles of the river between its headwaters and the Ventura County line, is 680 square miles, while the lower watershed, between the county line and the ocean is

¹ Lilien, J.P. Cumulative Impacts to Riparian Habitat in the Malibu Creek Watershed. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

954 square miles). The river flows approximately 84 miles from its headwaters east of Acton to its delta located between the cities of Ventura and Oxnard. Recent estimates (as of 2005) for the total amount of urbanization, including residential, industrial, and commercial areas, in the entire Santa Clara River watershed vary between 4 and 4.5 percent (approximately 4.5%, with most of the development located in the Santa Clarita area). Between 1988 and 2006, the Corps has issued approximately 228 permits that have resulted in actual impacts to waters of the U.S. (this number excludes permit actions where the same permit was issued multiple times, permits that were never utilized by the applicant, and permits that authorized an activity in the same location multiple times). Of these actions, more were associated with emergency repairs and maintenance than any other type of activity (approximately 25%, more than half of which were for emergency actions). The above 228 permit actions resulted in temporary impacts to approximately 480 acres and permanent impacts to approximately 149 acres of waters of the U.S., including approximately 15 acres of wetlands in the Santa Clara River watershed (temporary impacts are usually addressed with on-site restoration as opposed to compensatory mitigation requirements). As compensatory mitigation for the above permanent impacts to waters of the U.S., the Corps required a total of approximately 518 acres of preservation, creation, enhancement, and restoration of aquatic and riparian habitat in the Santa Clara River watershed.

To assess the current condition of the main stem of the Santa Clara River, an assessment was made to determine the condition for several reaches in the Santa Clara River downstream of the City of Santa Clarita. Based on the results of the fieldwork for the assessment, the main stem of the Santa Clara River exhibits relatively high physical and biological functions immediately downstream of the developed areas in Santa Clarita. The above assessment was completed in the summer of 2004 (and updated in 2007) and supports the results of past and present environmental assessments for Section 404 permit decisions in the Santa Clarita area that have determined that the Santa Clara River exhibits limited physical evidence of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts from urbanization, agriculture and other land use changes in the watershed. The purpose of this regional condition is to ensure that the NWP's would continue to have minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively, to aquatic and riparian habitat that exhibits relatively high physical and biological functions in the Santa Clara River watershed.

For additional information please see the supplemental decision document for Regional Condition 4d.

4.0 Alternatives

4.1 No Regional Conditions

Without regional conditions requiring notification in the Santa Monica Mountains, the Santa Clara watershed, special aquatic sites and perennial waters in the State of Arizona and desert regions of California, and EFH, there could be more than minimal impacts to waters of the U.S. that exhibit both high physical and biological functions, as well as contributing to substantial cumulative impacts in some portions of these areas. Without specific requirements for road crossings, there could be more than minimal impacts to certain endangered species, such as southern steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Without a regional condition prohibiting use of

NWP 24 in jurisdictional vernal pools there could be more than minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively, to these rare and unique aquatic resources which have experienced substantial losses historically. Overall, with no regional conditions, NWP 24 could be utilized in sensitive special aquatic sites in some areas with no review by the Corps or the resource agencies.

4.2 Alternative Regional Limits or Pre-Construction Notification Thresholds

To further ensure NWP 24 would have minimal impacts to aquatic resources, both individually and cumulatively, the Los Angeles District could augment the proposed notification requirements for NWP 24 by including all coastal watersheds. Alternatively, the Los Angeles District could eliminate the use of NWP 24 in all special aquatic sites, including wetlands.

The Los Angeles District could require notification for all projects that require authorization under NWP 24. Requiring notification for all activities permitted by a state administering its own section 404 permit program, not just those in the regions and resources identified by the Los Angeles District as warranting special attention (see Regional Condition 4), could increase the workload of the Los Angeles District without any commensurate benefits to aquatic resources. 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. With the proposed modifications to NWP 24, the Los Angeles District has identified the resources and watersheds that warrant additional scrutiny under NWP 24. As a result, the District's proposed modifications would result in a relatively minor increase in overall workload, but would provide potentially substantial benefits to the aquatic environment in the identified areas.

An alternative regional condition would prohibit the use of NWP 24 in all special aquatic sites in the Los Angeles District. The loss of approximately 90 percent of wetland resources in southern California and the general scarcity of special aquatic sites in this semi-arid region indicates there could be a need for the review of any project that would discharge dredged or fill material in a special aquatic site under the 404(b)(1) Guidelines and the public interest factors to ensure no adverse impacts to special aquatic sites. However, as discussed above, NWP 24 authorizes section 10 activities, in cases where section 404 authorization is required and the section 404 permit program is administered by a state or Indian tribe. This NWP authorizes work in navigable waters of the U.S., but it does not authorize discharges of dredged or fill material into those waters. When considering the inclusion of the constraints on NWP 24 from section 404 (g-1) of the CWA, 40 CFR Part 233, and the general conditions, a regional condition that precluded all discharges in special aquatic sites would unnecessarily increase our workload to review small-scale impacts in areas that exhibit lower physical and biological functions. As a result, this proposed modification would not be practicable and would result in relatively minor environmental benefits to the aquatic ecosystem. In conclusion, the majority of the projects that could be authorized under NWP 24 would likely have minimal impacts to the aquatic ecosystem. With the proposed regional conditions, the Los Angeles District would ensure that NWP 24 has minimal impacts on both sensitive resources and watersheds without a substantial increase in workload.

4.3 Alternative Regional Nationwide Permit Conditions

The Los Angeles District could develop the following separate Regional Conditions: 1) Agency notification for proposed use of this NWP; and/or 2) Post-project reporting for non-notifying uses of NWP 24. Based upon the limited use of this NWP in the Los Angeles District, existing NWP safeguards (mandatory notification for projects that may affect federally-listed species or historic properties), and the additional resource-specific restrictions written into the revised Regional Conditions, the Los Angeles District has determined that the consideration of alternative or additional regional conditions are unnecessary at this time to ensure minimal impacts and would adversely increase workload without commensurate benefits to the aquatic environment. Further, the implementation of alternative or additional regional conditions would be impracticable given the questionable benefit to the resource(s) and additional staff workload. With the proposed modifications to NWP 24, the Los Angeles District has identified the resources and watersheds that warrant additional scrutiny under NWP 24. As a result, the District's proposed modifications would result in a relatively minor increase in overall workload, but would provide potentially substantial benefits to the aquatic environment in the identified areas.

5.0 Endangered Species Act

5.1 General Considerations

NWP 24 authorizes section 10 activities, in cases where the section 404 authorization is required and the section 404 permit program is administered by a state or Indian tribe. This NWP authorizes work in navigable waters of the U.S., but it does not authorize discharges of dredged or fill material. Pre-construction notification is not required for activities authorized by this NWP. If the district engineer determines that the adverse effects of a particular project are more than minimal after considering mitigation, then discretionary authority will be asserted and the applicant will be notified that another form of DA authorization, such as a regional general permit or individual permit is required. In addition, the new General and Regional Conditions would provide further limitations on the use of NWP 24 in sensitive aquatic ecosystems. With these constraints, NWP 24 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 24, 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 24 specify notification pursuant to General Condition 31 for all projects in special aquatic sites as defined at 40 CFR Part 230.40-45 and perennial waters in the State of Arizona and desert regions of California, as well as for projects located in designated EFH. With the inclusion of these proposed notification requirements for NWP 24, the above long-term minor impacts to endangered and threatened species in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced. 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 Standard Local Operation Procedures (SLOPES), and the inclusion of additional notification requirements, the

use of NWP 24 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 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 Endangered Species Act (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 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 NWPs comply with the ESA and use of the NWPs shall be determined to have minimal impacts on threatened and endangered species in the Los Angeles District, pursuant to the 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 of the NWPs 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, Los Angeles District, Regulatory Branch and the USFWS, Ventura Office finalized SLOPES for informal and formal ESA consultations. In addition, some the activities authorized by the NWPs that may adversely affect EFH 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 NMFS. 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 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 NWPs comply with the ESA and use of the NWPs 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 NWP 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: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(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 24 would require notification for special aquatic sites and perennial waters in the State of Arizona and desert regions of California, all designated EFH, projects in the Santa Monica Mountains, and projects in the Santa Clara River watershed. Regional conditions would also preclude activities in jurisdictional vernal pools. With the inclusion of the notification requirements for NWP 24 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 require notification for any activity in any special aquatic site, including wetlands, in the State of Arizona and desert regions of California. With the inclusion of this modification, NWP 24 would have long-term minor impacts, both individually and cumulatively, to wetland resources in the Los Angeles District.

(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 24. Section 106 of the NHPA 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 24 are brought to the attention of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator and the state agency responsible for administering the 404 program 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 SHPO and the implementation of mitigation measures, the Corps would ensure that NWP 24 would result in minimal impacts to historic properties.

(g) Fish and wildlife values: The new general conditions would provide limitations on the use of NWP 24 in waters of the U.S. Due to the above constraints, NWP 24 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 24 require notification in special aquatic sites and perennial waters in the State of Arizona and the desert regions of California. With the inclusion of the proposed notification requirements for NWP 24 in sensitive watersheds and other aquatic resources, the above long-term minor impacts to fish and wildlife values in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced, resulting in minor impacts, both individually and cumulatively, in the Los Angeles District.

(h) Flood hazards: Same as discussed in the national decision document.

(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 new general conditions would provide further limitations on the use of NWP 24 in waters of the U.S. Due to the above constraints, NWP 24 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 24 would preclude activities in jurisdictional vernal pools. With the inclusion of notification requirements for NWP 24 in special aquatic sites and sensitive watersheds and other aquatic resources, the above long-term minor impacts to water quality in the Los Angeles District would be further reduced, resulting in minor impacts throughout the Los Angeles District.

(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)

The cumulative impacts 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 U.S. lost due to the activities authorized by this NWP.

Because NWP 24 has never been used in the Los Angeles District, historical data is not available to evaluate the potential cumulative effects of this NWP in the Los Angeles District. NWP 24 is not expected to be used in the near future. The Los Angeles District is not aware of any tribe within its boundaries that is seeking to administer its own Section 404 program. The states of California and Arizona have not expressed an interest in administering the Section 404 program. Since there are no historical impacts from the use of this NWP and there are no impacts expected in the foreseeable future, there would be no individual or cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment.

If, at a later time, there is clear, unequivocal evidence that the NWP would result in more than minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually and cumulatively, the modification, suspension, or revocation procedures at 33 CFR 330.4(e) or 33 CFR 330.5 will be used. Also, EPA has the right to conduct programmatic reviews of the state-administered section 404 Program. 40 CFR Part 233 specifies the procedures EPA will follow, and the criteria EPA will apply, in approving, reviewing, and withdrawing approval of state programs under Section 404 of the CWA.

See also the attached supplemental analysis (Section I).

10.0 List of Final Corps Regional Conditions for NWP 24

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 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.

10.3 Regional Condition 4

Submission of a PCN pursuant to General Condition 31 and Regional Condition 3 shall be required for all regulated activities in the following locations:

- a. All perennial waterbodies and special aquatic sites within the State of Arizona and within the Mojave and Sonoran (Colorado) desert regions of California, excluding the Colorado River in Arizona from Davis Dam to River Mile 261 (northern boundary of the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe Reservation). The desert region in California is limited to four USGS HUC accounting units (Lower Colorado -150301, Northern Mojave-180902, Southern Mojave-181001, and Salton Sea-181002).
- b. All areas designated as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (i.e., all tidally influenced areas - Federal Register dated March 12, 2007 (72 FR 11092)), in which case the PCN shall include an EFH assessment and extent of proposed impacts to EFH. Examples of EFH habitat assessments can be found at: <http://www.swr.noaa.gov/efh.htm>.
- c. All watersheds in the Santa Monica Mountains in Los Angeles and Ventura counties bounded by Calleguas Creek on the west, by Highway 101 on the north and east, and by Sunset Boulevard and Pacific Ocean on the south.
- d. The Santa Clara River watershed in Los Angeles and Ventura counties, including but not limited to Aliso Canyon, Agua Dulce Canyon, Sand Canyon, Bouquet Canyon, Mint Canyon, South Fork of the Santa Clara River, San Francisquito Canyon, Castaic Creek, Piru Creek, Sespe Creek and the main-stem of the Santa Clara River.

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 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 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 NWP 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 send 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 NWPs 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 NWP's 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.

NWP 24 authorizes section 10 activities, in cases where section 404 authorization is required and the section 404 permit program is administered by a state or Indian tribe. This NWP authorizes work in navigable waters of the United States, but it does not authorize discharges of dredged or fill material into those waters. Pre-construction notification is not required for activities authorized by this NWP. If the district engineer determines that the adverse effects of a particular project are more than minimal after considering mitigation, then discretionary authority will be asserted and the applicant will be notified that another form of Department of the Army (DA) authorization, such as a regional general permit or individual permit, is required (see 33 CFR 330.4(e) and 330.5). Due to these constraints, NWP 24 would generally result in minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively, in the majority of the Los Angeles District.

The Los Angeles District is not aware of any tribe within its boundaries that is seeking to administer its own Section 404 program. Nor have the states of California and Arizona have not expressed an interest in administering the Section 404 program. Therefore, the Los Angeles District does not expect any regional effects associated with the implementation of NWP 24. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the Los Angeles District's final regional conditions would help to ensure impacts from the use of NWP would be no more than minimal. The Los Angeles District would eliminate the use of NWP 24 in special aquatic sites in Arizona and the desert regions of California, including wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows, and riffle and pool complexes. With the inclusion of the above modifications to NWP 24, the Los Angeles District would ensure minimal impacts to jurisdictional vernal pools and special aquatic sites through additional review without substantially increasing our workload. Lastly, certain watersheds and resources in the Los Angeles District support high physical and biological functions that are threatened by cumulative impacts at the watershed level. To ensure that NWP 24 would have minimal impacts to these resources, the Los Angeles District would require notification for all projects in the

Santa Monica Mountains and Santa Clara River watersheds, special aquatic sites and perennial watercourses in desert regions, and areas designated as EFH. With the inclusion of the above modifications, the Los Angeles District would ensure minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively, for projects authorized under NWP 24.

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.