REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF
Regulatory Division

Scott Quinnell, Senior Environmental Planner
California Department of Transportation, District 8
464 West 4th Street Fl 6, MS-822
San Bernardino, California 92401-1400

SUBJECT: Approved Jurisdictional Determination regarding presence/absence of geographic jurisdiction

Dear Mr. Quinnell:

Reference is made to your request (File No. SPL-2013-00542-VCC), dated July 18, 2013, for an approved Department of the Army jurisdictional determination (JD) for the State Route 2 Slope Protection Project at Sheep Creek (lat/long: 34.373629°N, -117.608331°W), located near the City of Wrightwood, San Bernardino County, California.

As you may know, the Corps’ evaluation process for determining whether or not a Department of the Army permit is needed involves two tests. If both tests are met, then a permit is required. The first test determines whether or not the proposed project is located in a water of the United States (i.e., it is within the Corps’ geographic jurisdiction). The second test determines whether or not the proposed project is a regulated activity under section 10 of the River and Harbor Act or section 404 of the Clean Water Act. As part of the evaluation process, pertaining to the first test only, we have made the jurisdictional determination below.

Based on available information, we have determined there are no waters of the United States on the project site, in the locations depicted on the enclosed drawing. The basis for our determination can be found in the enclosed JD form(s).

The aquatic resource identified as Sheep Creek on the attached drawing are intrastate, isolated waters with no apparent interstate or foreign commerce connection. As such, these waters are not currently regulated by the Corps of Engineers. This disclaimer of jurisdiction is only for section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Other Federal, State, and local laws may apply to your activities. In particular, you may need authorization from the California State Water Resources Control Board and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

This letter contains an approved jurisdictional determination for the State Route 2 Slope Protection at Sheep Creek project site within the Sheep Creek watershed. If you object to this decision, you may request an administrative appeal under Corps regulations at 33 CFR part 331.
Enclosed you will find a Notification of Appeal Process (NAP) fact sheet (Appendix A) and Request for Appeal (RFA) form. If you request to appeal this decision you must submit a completed RFA form to the Corps South Pacific Division Office at the following address:

Tom Cavanaugh  
Administrative Appeal Review Officer,  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
South Pacific Division,CESPD-PDS-O, 2042B  
1455 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94103-1399

In order for an RFA to be accepted by the Corps, the Corps must determine that it is complete, that it meets the criteria for appeal under 33 C.F.R. section 331.5, and that it has been received by the Division Office within 60 days of the date on the NAP. Should you decide to submit an RFA form, it must be received at the above address by November 12, 2013. It is not necessary to submit an RFA form to the Division office if you do not object to the decision in this letter.

This verification is valid for five years from the date of this letter, unless new information warrants revision of the determination before the expiration date. If you wish to submit new information regarding the approved jurisdictional determination for this site, please submit this information to Veronica Chan at the letterhead address by November 12, 2013. The Corps will consider any new information so submitted and respond within 60 days by either revising the prior determination, if appropriate, or reissuing the prior determination. A revised or reissued jurisdictional determination can be appealed as described above.

This determination has been conducted to identify the extent of the Corps’ Clean Water Act jurisdiction on the particular project site identified in your request. This determination may not be valid for the wetland conservation provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985. If you or your tenant are USDA program participants, or anticipate participation in USDA programs, you should request a certified wetland determination from the local office of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, prior to starting work.

If you have any questions, please contact Veronica Chan at 213-452-3292 or via e-mail at Veronica.C.Chan@usace.army.mil.
Please be advised that you can now comment on your experience with Regulatory Division by accessing the Corps web-based customer survey form at:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mark D. Cohen
Deputy Chief, Regulatory Division

Enclosures
NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OPTIONS AND PROCESS AND REQUEST FOR APPEAL

Applicant: California Department of Transportation, District 8  
(POC: Scott Quinnell)  
File Number: SPL-2013-00542-VCC  
Date: 9/12/2013

Attached is: See Section below

| INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission) | A |
| PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission) | B |
| PERMIT DENIAL | C |
| X APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION | D |
| PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION | E |

SECTION I - The following identifies your rights and options regarding an administrative appeal of the above decision. Additional information may be found at [http://www.usace.army.mil/cecw/pages/reg_materials.aspx](http://www.usace.army.mil/cecw/pages/reg_materials.aspx) or Corps regulations at 33 CFR Part 331.

A: INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT: You may accept or object to the permit.

- **ACCEPT:** If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the district engineer for final authorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work is authorized. Your signature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations associated with the permit.

- **OBJECT:** If you object to the permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions therein, you may request that the permit be modified accordingly. You must complete Section II of this form and return the form to the district engineer. Your objections must be received by the district engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice, or you will forfeit your right to appeal the permit in the future. Upon receipt of your letter, the district engineer will evaluate your objections and may: (a) modify the permit to address all of your concerns, (b) modify the permit to address some of your objections, or (c) not modify the permit having determined that the permit should be issued as previously written. After evaluating your objections, the district engineer will send you a proffered permit for your reconsideration, as indicated in Section B below.

B: PROFFERED PERMIT: You may accept or appeal the permit

- **ACCEPT:** If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the district engineer for final authorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work is authorized. Your signature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations associated with the permit.

- **APPEAL:** If you choose to decline the proffered permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions therein, you may appeal the declined permit under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

C: PERMIT DENIAL: You may appeal the denial of a permit under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

D: APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You may accept or appeal the approved JD or provide new information.

- **ACCEPT:** You do not need to notify the Corps to accept an approved JD. Failure to notify the Corps within 60 days of the date of this notice, means that you accept the approved JD in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the approved JD.

- **APPEAL:** If you disagree with the approved JD, you may appeal the approved JD under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

E: PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You do not need to respond to the Corps regarding the preliminary JD. The Preliminary JD is not appealable. If you wish, you may request an approved JD (which may be appealed), by contacting the Corps district for further instruction. Also you may provide new information for further consideration by the Corps to reevaluate the JD.
### SECTION II - REQUEST FOR APPEAL or OBJECTIONS TO AN INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT

**REASONS FOR APPEAL OR OBJECTIONS:** (Describe your reasons for appealing the decision or your objections to an initial proffered permit in clear concise statements. You may attach additional information to this form to clarify where your reasons or objections are addressed in the administrative record.)

---

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** The appeal is limited to a review of the administrative record, the Corps memorandum for the record of the appeal conference or meeting, and any supplemental information that the review officer has determined is needed to clarify the administrative record. Neither the appellant nor the Corps may add new information or analyses to the record. However, you may provide additional information to clarify the location of information that is already in the administrative record.

---

**POINT OF CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS OR INFORMATION:**

| If you have questions regarding this decision and/or the appeal process you may contact: | If you only have questions regarding the appeal process you may also contact:  
Thomas J. Cavanaugh  
Administrative Appeal Review Officer  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
South Pacific Division  
1455 Market Street, 2052B  
San Francisco, California 94103-1399  
Phone: (415) 503-6574  
Fax: (415) 503-6646  
Email: thomas.j.cavanaugh@usace.army.mil |
---|---|

**RIGHT OF ENTRY:** Your signature below grants the right of entry to Corps of Engineers personnel, and any government consultants, to conduct investigations of the project site during the course of the appeal process. You will be provided a 15 day notice of any site investigation, and will have the opportunity to participate in all site investigations.

| Signature of appellant or agent. | Date: | Telephone number: |
---|---|---|

---

*SPD version revised December 17, 2010*
Administrative Appeal Process for Approved Jurisdictional Determinations

1. District issues approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) to applicant/landowner with NAP.

2. Does applicant/landowner accept approved JD?
   - Yes
     - District makes new approved JD.
   - No
     - Applicant/landowner provides new information?
       - Yes
         - Applicant decides to appeal approved JD. Applicant submits RFA to division engineer within 60 days of date of NAP.
       - No
         - Corps reviews RFA and notifies appellant within 30 days of receipt.

3. To continue with appeal process, appellant must revise RFA. See Appendix D.

4. Is RFA acceptable?
   - No
     - Division engineer or designee renders a decision on the merits of the appeal within 90 days of receipt of an acceptable RFA.
   - Yes
     - Optional JD Appeals Meeting and/or site investigation.

5. RO reviews record and the division engineer (or designee) renders a decision on the merits of the appeal within 90 days of receipt of an acceptable RFA.

6. Does the appeal have merit?
   - Yes
     - District's decision is upheld; appeal process completed.
   - No
     - District's decision is upheld; appeal process completed.

Appendix C
This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 26-Aug-2013

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Los Angeles District, Sheep Creek Levee Repair State Route 2. SPL-2013-00542-VCC

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State: California
County/parish/borough: San Bernadino County
City: Wrightwood
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.373629° N, Long. -117.608331° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: •NAD83 / UTM zone 11N
Name of nearest waterbody: Sheep Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: N/A
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Sheep Creek Watershed (HUC 1809020804)

Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc…) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
☐ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 8-August-2013
☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
There Are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
☐ Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
☐ Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. Explain: .

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
There Are no “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.
   a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): 1
   - TNWs, including territorial seas
   - Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
   - Relatively permanent waters2 (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
   - Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
   - Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
   - Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
   - Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
   - Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
   - Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

   b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:
   - Non-wetland waters: 400 linear feet: 270 width (ft) and/or 2.35 acres.
   - Wetlands: acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List
   - Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): 3
   ☒ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
   - Explain: The non-RPW, Sheep Creek, drains to El Mirage Dry Lake, which has no connection to a TNW. No commerce related to surface waters on El Mirage Dry Lake or associated drainages exists. Sheep Creek drains to El Mirage Dry Lake and is intermittent to ephemeral and does not support surface water-based commerce. No commerce related to surface-waters on El Mirage Dry Lake exists, as the lake is dry most of the year. Sheep Creek within the Project area

---

1 Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.
2 For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least “seasonally” (e.g., typically 3 months).
3 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
does not meet the criteria for a jurisdictional Water of the U.S. Therefore, Sheep Creek is non-jurisdictional under SWANCC.
SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over TNWs and wetlands adjacent to TNWs. If the aquatic resource is a TNW, complete Section III.A.1 and Section III.D.1. only; if the aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

1. TNW
   Identify TNW: .
   Summarize rationale supporting determination: .

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW
   Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”: .

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

This section summarizes information regarding characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under Rapanos have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are “relatively permanent waters” (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant nexus evaluation. Corps districts and EPA regions will include in the record any available information that documents the existence of a significant nexus between a relatively permanent tributary that is not perennial (and its adjacent wetlands if any) and a traditional navigable water, even though a significant nexus finding is not required as a matter of law.

If the waterbody4 is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

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

   (i) General Area Conditions:
      Watershed size: Pick List
      Drainage area: Pick List
      Average annual rainfall: inches
      Average annual snowfall: inches

   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
      (a) Relationship with TNW:
         □ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
         □ Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.

         Project waters are Pick List river miles from TNW.
         Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.
         Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
         Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
         Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

         Identify flow route to TNW5: .
         Tributary stream order, if known: .

4 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
5 Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.
(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):

**Tributary is:**
- [ ] Natural

**Tributary** properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
- Average width: feet
- Average depth: feet
- Average side slopes: Pick List.

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

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


Tributary geometry: Pick List

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

**Tributary provides for:** Pick List

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List

Describe flow regime: .

Other information on duration and volume: .


Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings: .
- [ ] Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):
- [ ] Bed and banks
- [ ] OHWM\(^6\) (check all indicators that apply):
  - [ ] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
  - [ ] changes in the character of soil
  - [ ] shelving
  - [ ] vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
  - [ ] leaf litter disturbed or washed away
  - [ ] sediment deposition
  - [ ] water staining
  - [ ] other (list):
- [ ] Discontinuous OHWM.\(^7\) Explain: .

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):
- [ ] High Tide Line indicated by:
  - [ ] oil or scum line along shore objects
  - [ ] fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
  - [ ] physical markings/characteristics
  - [ ] tidal gauges
  - [ ] other (list):
- [ ] Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
  - [ ] survey to available datum;
  - [ ] physical markings;
  - [ ] vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

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

Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

---

\(^6\)A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody’s flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

\(^7\)Ibid.
(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):

☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
☐ Habitat for:
  ☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
  ☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
  ☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
  ☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
  Properties:
  Wetland size:     acres
  Wetland type. Explain: .
  Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
  Flow is: Pick List. Explain: .
  Surface flow is: Pick List
  Characteristics: .
  Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings: .
  ☐ Dye (or other) test performed: .

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
  ☐ Directly abutting
  ☐ Not directly abutting
  ☐ Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: .
  ☐ Ecological connection. Explain: .
  ☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:
  Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW.
  Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
  Flow is from: Pick List.
  Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the Pick List floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
  Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: .
  Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):
  ☐ Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): .
  ☐ Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: .
  ☐ Habitat for:
    ☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
    ☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
    ☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
    ☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
  All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List
  Approximately (       ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW. Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the Rapanos Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below:

1. Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D:

2. Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:

3. Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands. Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:
   - TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
   - Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:
   - Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: .

3. **Non-RPWs** that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):
   - Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
   - Other non-wetland waters: acres.
   - Identify type(s) of waters: .

4. **Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
   - Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .
   - Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow “seasonally.” Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

   Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

5. **Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

6. **Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

7. **Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.**
   - As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.
     - Demonstrate that impoundment was created from “waters of the U.S.” or
     - Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
     - Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

E. **ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):**
   - which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
   - from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
   - which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
   - Interstate isolated waters. Explain: .
   - Other factors. Explain: .

   Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

---

8See Footnote # 3.
9 To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
10 Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Wetlands: acres.

Identify type(s) of waters:.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements.
- Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.
- Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR).

Waters do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain:

Other: (explain, if not covered above):

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all that apply):

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): 400 linear feet width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:
- Wetlands: acres.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:
- Wetlands: acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply) - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below:

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant:
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
- Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
- Corps navigable waters’ study:
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):Google Earth, 2013.
- or Other (Name & Date):
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Sheep Creek is situated on the northern face of the San Gabriel Mountains and extends northward into the Mojave Desert. Sheep Creek drains a 1,043-acre watershed and ranges in elevation from 8,500 feet to 6,800 feet mean sea level. The width of the wash ranges from about 80 meters near the mountain front to about 3 meters as flows decrease downstream. The stream channel has a slope of approximately 12% within the project reach. Sheep Creek flows in response to snow melts and storm
Precipitation at the higher altitudes of the San Gabriel Mountains averages more than 1,000 mm/yr, with much of the precipitation falling as snow during the winter months. The amount of precipitation decreases northward away from the mountain front and in most years averages less than 150 mm/yr along the downstream parts. Flows in Sheep Creek decrease in frequency and duration with distance downstream. Within the project site the OHWM is identified by clear cut bed and banks due to channel incision, with the onsite acreage of Sheep Creek consisting of approximately 0.27 acres. Sheep Creek wash drains approximately 150 miles northwards into the Mohave Desert, ending near El Mirage Dry Lake. The downstream hydrological terminus of Sheep Creek is El Mirage Dry Lake, an intrastate dry lake. El Mirage Dry Lake is the elevational low point for drainages that fall within the El Mirage Valley Groundwater Basin. It serves as the terminus for Sheep Creek, as well as for all other waters within this isolated intermontaine basin. All surface flows that enter El Mirage Dry Lake either evaporate or percolate into the groundwater table. Surface waters for the El Mirage Dry Lake system are isolated from the Mojave River (located 10-aerial miles farther to the east) by the Shadow Mountains, Adobe Mountain and Nash Hill that surround the dry lake on its north and northwest boundaries, respectively. Also, the elevations east of El Mirage Lake are higher due to the foothills of the Shadow Mountains by 20 feet. Currently, there are no published commercial uses of Sheep Creek surface waters. Mountain High Ski Resort is located within Upper Swarthout Creek, tributary to Sheep Creek; however, the Ski Resort uses stored groundwater to create man-made snow for ski related recreational uses. Any natural and man-made snow melts flow to or are diverted to Sheep Creek or its tributaries. Published recreational uses for El Mirage Dry Lake are limited to a few non-surface water uses, including OHV use, rockhounding, wildlife watching, OHV, and ultralight and other aircraft activity. El Mirage Dry Lake, as the terminus for Sheep Creek, is NOT a TNW. Moreover, El Mirage Dry Lake is NOT an (a)(3) water as defined by 33 CFR section 328.3. El Mirage Dry Lake does NOT meet criteria (a)(3)(i-iii), as it: i) DOES NOT have use for surface water recreation or other purposes by foreign or interstate travelers, ii) DOES NOT have harvesting activities of fish or shell fish that may be sold in interstate or foreign commerce, and iii) DOES NOT have surface water industrial usage by industries in interstate commerce. Lastly, Sheep Creek is NOT an (a)(3) water as defined by 33 CFR section 328.3. Review of aerial photographs (Google Earth) did not show surface water usage of the project drainage or the dry lake terminus. Therefore, since El Mirage Dry Lake is an intrastate, isolated water without a surface water connection to commerce. Sheep Creek as part of the overall watershed system is also isolated and additionally has no nexus to commerce. Based on the above information, the Corps conclude that Sheep Creek (isolated non-RPW) is a NON-JURISDICTIONAL water of the United States, since the water is NOT tributary to either a TNW or an (a)(3) water and is NOT an (a)(3) water itself. The Corps made such a conclusion since the water is a tributary to an isolated, intrastate dry lake.

Other Approved Jurisdictional Determinations within the region have shown that the waters in the area are not jurisdictional, including File Number SPL-2011-01137-SLP (dated March 7, 2012), which gives further evidence for not asserting jurisdiction over Sheep Creek.
0Q600 Creek Information

Linear feet of creek = 400 linear feet

Width of Creek = 270 feet

sheep creek study area = 2.35 acres