



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
LOS ANGELES DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
VENTURA FIELD OFFICE
2151 ALESSANDRO DRIVE, SUITE 110
VENTURA, CALIFORNIA 93001

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

February 5, 2008

Office of the Chief
Regulatory Division

Kenneth Stein
Beacon Solar, LLC
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, Florida 33408

Dear Mr. Stein:

Reference is made to your letter (Corps File No. 2007-1414-CLM), dated November 5, 2007 for a Department of the Army Jurisdictional Determination to construct a wind power generation project in unnamed tributaries to Koehn Dry Lake within an unincorporated area of Kern County, California.

Based on the information furnished in your letter, we have determined that Kohn Dry Lake does not exhibit any evidence of navigation. Using the criteria at 33 CFR Part 328.3, the Corps has determined that Koehn Dry Lake exhibits insufficient evidence of interstate commerce to meet the requirements of 33 CFR Part 328.3(a)(3)(iii) and does not meet the requirements for navigability at 33 CFR Part 328.3 (a)(1). Based on the above information and the Solid Waste Agency of Northern County Supreme Court Decision, your project does not discharge dredged or fill material into a water of the United States or an adjacent wetland. Therefore, the project is not subject to our jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and a Section 404 permit is not required from our office.

Please be aware that our determination does not preclude the need to comply with Section 13260 of the California Water Code (Porter/Cologne) and we recommend that you contact the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to insure compliance with the above regulations. Furthermore, our determination does not obviate the need to obtain other Federal, state, or local authorizations required by law.

This letter contains an approved jurisdictional determination for the Beacon Street Solar Energy Project. 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 C) 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, CESPDPDS-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. Part 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 April 6, 2008. 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 Crystal L. Marquez at the letterhead address by April 6, 2008. 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.

A courtesy copy of this letter has been sent to Mr. Joshua Zinn, EDAW Inc., 1420 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 500, San Diego, CA 92101. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Crystal L. Marquez at (805) 585-2143. Please be advised that you can now comment on your experience with Regulatory Division by accessing the Corps web-based customer survey form at: <http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>.

Sincerely,



Antal Szijj
Senior Project Manager
North Coast Branch

Enclosures



AECOM
1420 Kettner Boulevard
Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
www.aecom.com

619.233.1454 tel
619.233.0952 fax

March 20, 2012

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
North Coast Branch Regulatory Division
2151 Alessandro Drive, Suite 110
Ventura, CA 93001

**Re: RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Transmission
Line Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report**

Dear Mr. Henderson:

Introduction

On May 13, 2011, AECOM prepared a formal jurisdictional delineation letter report (JDLR) for the Barren Ridge Photovoltaic (PV) Solar Electrical Generation Facilities project proposed by Recurrent Energy (Attachment A).

This JDLR was submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for confirmation of methods and field findings and to obtain a jurisdictional determination (JD) for waters that presented “geographic isolation” and no potential for interstate commerce or navigability (e.g., were nonjurisdictional waters of the U.S.).

On October 12, 2011, USACE issued an Approved JD (File No. SPL-2011-00511-BAH) identifying that the Barren Ridge project site does not contain waters of the U.S. pursuant to 33 CFR 325.9 and that “a Department of the Army permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act is not required” (Attachment B).

As an additional component of the Barren Ridge PV project, Recurrent Energy is proposing a generation tie-line that includes an area not formally delineated. This JDLR intends to be a supplement to the May 13, 2011, JDLR for the Barren Ridge PV project.

As part of the environmental review process, this JDLR summarizes the latest federal and state guidance and methodologies employed in conducting a formal delineation for potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and State of California (state); the results of the fieldwork; and the amount, type, and location of the formally delineated potential jurisdictional waters occurring within the tie-line survey area.

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 2

Summary

Based on the results of the formal field delineation within the tie-line survey area it has been determined that there are 0.0^{1,2} acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S.^{3,4} and approximately 2.16 acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the state exclusively^{5,6} have been formally delineated. Of these approximately 2.16 acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the state occurring within the survey area, approximately 1.01 acres is composed of southern alluvial fan scrub, approximately 0.92 acre is composed of unvegetated ephemeral dry wash, and approximately 0.23 acre is composed of unvegetated swale.

Project Description

Currently, two options are proposed for the generation tie-line; one is 1.75 miles long (Option A) and the other (Option B) is 1.94 miles long. Option A is the eastern generation tie-line alignment and Option B is the western alignment. Both tie-line options extend from the northeast corner of the Barren Ridge PV project site to the north and connect to the existing Los Angeles Department of Public Works Barren Ridge substation (Attachment C, Figures 1 and 2). The tie-line survey area encompasses both tie-line options (Attachment C, Figure 3).

¹ All acreages are rounded to the nearest hundredth (which may account for minor rounding error).

² Final acreages of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are based on the jurisdictional determination (JD) process per the March 30, 2007, *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination Form Instructional Guidebook*; the June 5, 2007, Approved JD Form; the June 5, 2007, Joint Guidance Memorandum; the December 2, 2008, Guidance Memorandum; and Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) 08-02 (if RGL 08-02 is deemed applicable and appropriate [i.e., the permit applicant or other "affected party" can decline to request and obtain an Approved JD and elect to use a Preliminary JD instead] for a jurisdictional determination of this formal jurisdictional delineation).

³ Final acreages of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are based on the JD process per the March 30, 2007, *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination Form Instructional Guidebook*; the June 5, 2007, Approved JD Form; the June 5, 2007, Joint Guidance Memorandum; the December 2, 2008, Guidance Memorandum; and RGL 08-02 (if RGL 08-02 is deemed applicable and appropriate [i.e., the permit applicant or other "affected party" can decline to request and obtain an Approved JD and elect to use a Preliminary JD instead] for nonbinding written indication that there may be waters of the U.S., including wetlands, on a parcel or indications of the approximate location[s] of waters of the U.S. or wetlands on a parcel). Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are relevant to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs), and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) regulatory permitting, if applicable.

⁴ Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are under the purview of USACE, with oversight by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the RWQCB (Lahontan Region 6). Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. include jurisdictional waters of the state. Federal and state jurisdictions do overlap but would remain distinct for regulatory administration and permitting purposes.

⁵ Relevant to CDFG and RWQCB permitting only.

⁶ Jurisdictional waters of the state are under the purview of CDFG and the RWQCB. State jurisdictions often exceed, in lateral extent and area, federal jurisdiction. Therefore, jurisdictional waters of the state include jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (as applicable). Although federal and state jurisdictions do overlap, they would remain distinct for regulatory administration and permitting purposes.



Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 3

Regulatory Framework

Aquatic environments/habitats occurring within California are regulated under the following federal and state laws:

Federal Regulations

USACE

Pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), USACE is authorized to regulate any activity that would result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional waters of the U.S., which include those waters listed in 33 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 328 (Definitions). USACE, with oversight by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), has the principal authority to issue CWA Section 404 Permits.

Pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) certifies that any discharge into jurisdictional waters of the U.S. will comply with state water quality standards. The RWQCB, as delegated by USEPA, has the principal authority to issue a CWA Section 401 water quality certification.

State Regulations

CDFG

Pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (CFG) Section 1600 *et seq.* of the CFGC regulates activities of an applicant's project that would *substantially* alter the flow, bed, channel, or bank of streams or lakes unless certain conditions outlined by CDFG are met by the applicant. The limits of CDFG jurisdiction are defined in CFGC Section 1600 *et seq.* as the "bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream,⁷ or lake designated by the department in which there is at any time an existing fish or wildlife resource or from which these resources derive benefit."⁸ However, in practice, CDFG usually extends its jurisdictional limit and assertion to the top of a bank of a stream, the bank of a lake, or outer edge of the riparian vegetation, whichever is wider.

⁷ The California Code of Regulations (Title 14 CCR 1.72) defines a stream as "a body of water that flows at least periodically or intermittently through a bed or channel having banks and supports fish or other aquatic life. This includes watercourses having a surface or subsurface flow that supports or has supported riparian vegetation."

⁸ This also includes the habitat upon which they depend on for continued viability (California Fish and Game Code Division 5, Chapter 1, Section 45, and Division 2, Chapter 1, Section 711.2[a], respectively).



Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 4

For desert aquatic features, CDFG provides specific guidance concerning their regulatory administration in California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 720 (Designation of Waters of Department Interest), which states:

For the purpose of implementing Sections 1601 and 1603 of the Fish and Game Code which requires submission to the department of general plans sufficient to indicate the nature of a project for construction by or on behalf of any person, governmental agency, state or local, and any public utility, of any project which will divert, obstruct or change the natural flow or bed of any river, stream or lake designated by the department, or will use material from the streambeds designated by the department, all rivers, streams, lakes, and streambeds in the State of California, including all rivers, streams and streambeds *which may have intermittent flows of water*, are hereby designated for such purpose (italics added).

RWQCB

Pursuant to Section 13000 *et seq.* of the California Water Code (CWC) (the 1969 Porter-Cologne Act), the RWQCB is authorized to regulate any activity that would result in discharges of waste and fill material into waters of the state, including "isolated" waters and wetlands. Waters of the state include any surface or groundwater within the boundaries of the state (CWC Section 13050[e]). Porter-Cologne authorizes the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to adopt, review, and revise policies for all waters of the state and directs the RWQCB to develop regional Basin Plans. CWC Section 13170 also authorizes the SWRCB to adopt water quality control plans on its own initiative. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (North and South Basins [RWQCB Region 6] (1995, as amended RWQCB 2011a) is designed to preserve and enhance the quality of water resources. The purpose of the plan is to designate beneficial uses of the surface and ground waters, designate water quality objectives for the reasonable protection of those uses, and establish an implementation plan to achieve the objectives within RWQCB Region 6.

Jurisdictional Delineation Methodology

Presurvey Investigations

Prior to conducting the field assessment for potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state (including wetlands) within the tie-line survey area, Ecologist Joshua Zinn (AECOM) reviewed the Barren Ridge PV project JDLR, historical land use of the tie-line survey area, local and regional climactic data, and areas with topographical configurations and vegetative signatures occurring within the survey area that may suggest the presence of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state at the time of the field survey. This information was evaluated by consulting the following available sources:

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 5

- 7.5-minute Survey Mojave NE Quadrangle (USGS 1973)
- The web-based National Hydrography Dataset (USGS 2012a)
- 2010 aerial maps of the Proposed Project survey area (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] National Agriculture Imagery Program) (USDA 2010)
- The web-based National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands Mapper (USFWS 2012)
- The web-based California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES), California Wetlands Information System Wetland Databases and Inventories (CERES 2012)
- The web-based Information Center for the Environment (U.C. Davis 2012a)
- The web-based California Soil Resource Lab (U.C. Davis 2012b)
- The web-based National List of Hydric Soils (NRCS 2012a)
- The web-based Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2012b)
- The web-based Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO) (NRCS 2012c)
- The web-based U.S. General Soil Map (STATSGO) (NRCS 2012d)
- The web-based California Watershed Portal (CalEPA 2012)
- The web-based California Watershed Network (CWN 2012)
- The web-based Office of Water Programs, Water Quality Planning Tool (CSUS 2012)
- The web-based Digital Watershed (USEPA 2012)
- The web-based Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC 2012)
- The web-based National Weather Service Climate Office (NOAA 2012a)
- The web-based National Weather Service Telecommunications Operations Center (NOAA 2012b)

Field Assessment

After pre-field analysis was completed, a field assessment was conducted within the survey area utilizing the latest federal and state guidance and methodologies, including but not limited to:

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 6

- a. *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (1987 Manual) (Environmental Laboratory 1987)
- b. *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0)* (2008 Supplement) (Environmental Laboratory 2008)⁹
- c. *USACE Wetland Plants of Specialized Habitats in the Arid West* (Lichvar and Dixon 2007)
- d. *A Field Guide to the Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States: A Delineation Manual* (Lichvar and McColley 2008)¹⁰
- e. *Review and Synopsis of Natural and Human Controls on Fluvial Channel Processes in the Arid West Channels* (Lichvar and Field 2007)
- f. *Distribution of Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) Indicators and their Reliability in Identifying the Limits of "Waters Of The United States" in Arid Southwestern Channels* (Lichvar et al. 2006)
- g. All applicable USACE Regulatory Guidance Letters for other waters¹¹
- h. All applicable state law and resource codes
- i. *Classification of Wetland and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin et al. 1979)
- j. *A Review of Stream Processes and Forms in Dryland Watersheds* (CDFG 2010)

These guidance manuals were used to determine the presence or absence of potential jurisdictional waters occurring within the tie-line survey area. A post-field assessment was also conducted to compare and confirm with the pre-field assessment.

Jurisdictional Assessment Results

The tie-line survey area is composed of Mojave creosote bush scrub (Holland Code 34100) habitat and southern alluvial fan scrub (Holland Code 63330) (Attachment C, Figure 4). Both vegetation communities are considered as upland habitat. However, southern alluvial fan scrub is wash dependent (Holland 1986).

⁹ It should be noted that the 1987 Manual and 2008 Regional Supplement are guidance documents for delineating waters in the form of wetlands only.

¹⁰ Datasheets from this field delineation manual were used as guidance documents for this delineation and are not included in this JDLR.

¹¹ RGL 88-06; RGL 05-05.

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 7

The four soil series occurring within the survey area are, in order of occurrence: Arizo Gravelly Loamy Sand, Cajon Loamy Sand, Whitewolf Loam, and Muroc Sandy Loam. All soils occurring within the tie-line survey area are not considered or listed as hydric (NRCS 2012a) (Attachment C, Figure 5).

The tie-line survey area is located within the central-northern portion of the approximately 3,366-square-mile Antelope-Fremont Valleys Watershed (Hydrologic Unit Code: 18090206) and is located within the RWQCB Lahontan Region South Basin (RWQCB Region 6), the approximately 909-square-mile Fremont Hydrologic Unit (625.00), and the approximately 719-square-mile Koehn Hydrologic Area (625.40). There is no hydrologic subarea (Attachment C, Figure 6). There are no water bodies occurring within the project area that are listed on the CWA 303(d) List (impaired water bodies) (SWRQB 2012).¹²

Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.

The extent and distribution of the collective area of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. occurring within the project area is 0.0 acre (Attachment C, Figure 7; see above and also Footnote 2 pertaining to the JD process). Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are listed for each aquatic habitat in Table 1. Aquatic-related habitats have been classified according to both the *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California* (Holland 1986) and *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin et al. 1979). Both classification systems incorporate a hierarchical structure of systems, subsystems, and classes to identify vegetation communities, wetland habitat types, and cover types. The vegetation occurring within the project area is typically associated with desert scrub ecosystems occurring within this vicinity of California.

Jurisdictional Determination for Potential Waters of the U.S. within the Tie-Line Survey Area

The completed Approved JD form, for geographically isolated nonjurisdictional waters of the U.S. occurring within the tie-line survey area, has been prepared following federal guidance, as applicable, to USACE (Los Angeles District, South Coast Branch) and is included in Attachment D to this JDLR.¹³

¹² Section 303 of the CWA requires states (and tribes) to adopt water quality standards for all surface waters of the U.S. Additionally, Section 303 of the CWA requires states to identify and make a list of surface water bodies that are polluted (impaired). This list is referred to as the "303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments" (SWRCB 2012).

¹³ The USACE district engineer retains the discretion to use an Approved JD in any other circumstance where he or she determines that it is appropriate given the facts of the particular case (RGL 08-02 [4][c]).

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 8

Potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. were assessed and delineated within the tie-line survey area and determined not to be federally jurisdictional waters under the regulatory administration of USACE (Attachment C, Figure 7). The ephemeral dry wash presents geographic isolation with no hydrological or ecological surface connection to a Traditionally Navigable Water. The ephemeral dry washes occurring within the survey area either abate into the landscape or form a confluence with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash, which is a tributary to Koehn Dry Lake. Using the criteria outlined in 33 CFR 328.3 it has been determined that Koehn Dry Lake exhibits insufficient evidence of interstate commerce to meet the requirements of 33 CFR 328.3(a)(3)(iii) and does not meet the requirements for navigability at 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1).

Because the delineated aquatic features within the survey area either abate into upland or form a confluence with Koehn Dry Lake they are not subject to USACE jurisdiction under Section 404 of the CWA. Therefore, all waters delineated within the tie-line survey area are considered as “geographically isolated” waters (e.g., potential nonjurisdictional waters of the U.S. [including final acreages and types]).¹⁴

Additionally, all ephemeral dry washes within the Barren Ridge PV project area (which are located within the same alluvial fan as the tie-line survey area) form a confluence, through unnamed ephemeral tributaries, with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash (which is also an ephemeral wash tributary to Koehn Dry Lake) (USGS 1973, 2012a, 2012b). There has been an Approved JD for isolation (nonjurisdictional waters for the Barren Ridge PV survey area [Attachment B]) and an Approved JD for nonjurisdictional waters for Koehn Dry Lake (please see Attachment C [Approved JD Letter for Beacon Solar, LLC] of Attachment A to this JDLR).

Jurisdictional Waters of the State

The extent and distribution of the collective area of potential jurisdictional waters of the state occurring within the project area is approximately 2.16 acres (Figure 7). Jurisdictional waters of the state are also listed for each aquatic habitat in Table 1.

Photo locations and representative photos taken during the field delineation are included in Attachment C, Figures 7 through 9.

¹⁴ 33 CFR 328.3(a)(3).

Bruce Henderson
 Sr. Project Manager
 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 March 20, 2012
 Page 9

Table 1
Summary of Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. and State
Occurring within the Tie-Line Survey Area^{a,b}

Type of Potential Jurisdictional Waters	Type of Habitat (Holland 1986)	Type of Habitat (Cowardin et al. 1979)	Acres	Linear Feet	Regulatory Authority
Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Subtotal Potential Waters of the U.S.</i>			<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	
Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the State, Exclusively					
Xeric Riparian Extent	Southern Alluvial Fan Scrub Channel (Holland Code 63330)	Palustrine; Scrub/Shrub, Broad-Leaved, Evergreen, Intermittently Flooded/ Temporary, Well Drained/Fresh, Alkaline	1.01	540	CDFG and RWQCB
Unvegetated Ephemeral Dry Wash	Nonvegetated Floodplain or Channel (Holland Code 64200)	Riverine; Intermittent; Unconsolidated Bottom, Sand, Intermittently Flooded, Alkaline	0.92	660	CDFG and RWQCB
Unvegetated Swale	Mojave Creosote Bush Scrub (Holland Code 34100) ^c	Mojave Creosote Bush Scrub is not considered an aquatic habitat by Cowardin ^d	0.23	240	CDFG and RWQCB
<i>Subtotal Potential Waters of the State</i>			<i>2.16</i>	<i>1,440</i>	
Grand Total Jurisdictional Waters			2.16	1,440	

^a Based on the total area of jurisdictional waters delineated within the Barren Ridge tie-line survey area.
^b Acreage of all jurisdictional waters was determined by using the GIS program ArcGIS. All acreages are rounded to the nearest hundredth after summation, which may account for minor rounding error.
^c Although swales are unvegetated they are within the larger Mojave creosote bush scrub habitat.
^d Swales are microtopographic features that convey surface water in low volume and short duration (hours to days [usually in sheetflow]) and are commonly associated with riverine features (Hauer and Lamberti 2007).

Please contact me at (619) 764-6829 or joshua.zinn@aecom.com with any questions or requests concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

Joshua Zinn
 Ecologist and Regulatory Specialist



Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 10

Attachment A – May 13, 2011 Barren Ridge Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report

Attachment B – Jurisdictional Determination for RE Barren Ridge 1 Photovoltaic Solar Electrical Generation facilities Project (File No. SPL-2011-00511-BAH)

Attachment C – Figures:

- Figure 1 – Regional Map
- Figure 2 – Project Vicinity
- Figure 3 – Survey Area
- Figure 4 – Vegetation Communities
- Figure 5 – Soils
- Figure 6 – Watersheds
- Figure 7 – Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the State
- Figure 8 – Representative Photographs 1 and 2
- Figure 9 – Representative Photographs 3 and 4

Attachment D – Approved JD Form

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 11

References

- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
2010 *A Review of Stream Processes and Forms in Dryland Watersheds*.
Sacramento.
- California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA)
2012 California Watershed Portal (CWP). Available at <http://cwp.resources.ca.gov/>.
Accessed February 2012.
- California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES)
2012 California Wetlands Information System Wetland Databases and Inventories.
Available at <http://www.ceres.ca.gov/>. Accessed February 2012.
- California State University Sacramento (CSUS) Office of Water Programs
2012 Available at <http://www.owp.csus.edu/research/stormwatertools/>. Accessed
February 2012.
- California Watershed Network (CWN)
2012 Available at <http://www.watershednetwork.org/>. Accessed February 2012.
- Cowardin, L., V. Carter, F. Golet, and E. LaRoe
1979 *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*.
U.S. Department of Interior. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-79/31.
February.
- Environmental Laboratory
1987 *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*. Technical Report Y-87-1.
U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. Vicksburg, Mississippi.
- 2008 *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual:
Arid West Region (Version 2.0)*. September.
- Hauer, Richard and Gary A. Lamberti (editors)
2007 *Methods in Stream Ecology*. Second Edition. London: Academic Press.
- Holland, R. F.
1986 *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California*.
Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game.
- Lichvar, R. W., and L. Dixon
2007 *Wetland Plants of Specialized Habitats in the Arid West*. USACE
ERDC/CRREL TR-07-8. June.

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 12

Lichvar, R. W., and J. J. Field

2007 Review and Synopsis of Natural and Human Controls on Fluvial Channel Processes in the Arid West USACE ERDC/CRREL TR-07-16. September.

Lichvar, R. W., D. C. Finnegan, M. P. Ericsson., and W. Ochs

2006 Distribution of Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) Indicators and their Reliability in Identifying the Limits of Waters of the United States in Arid Southwestern Channels. USACE ERDC/CRREL TR-06-5. February.

Lichvar, R. W., and S. M. McColley

2008 A Field Guide to the Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States: A Delineation Manual. USACE ERDC/CRREL TR-08-12. August.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

2012a National Weather Service Forecast Office. Available at <http://www.nws.noaa.gov/climate/index.php?wfo=sgx>. Accessed February 2012.

2012b National Weather Service Telecommunications Operations Center, Campo, California, United States. Available at <http://weather.noaa.gov/weather/current/KCZZ.html>. Accessed February 2012.

Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)

2012a National List of Hydric Soils. Available at <http://soils.usda.gov/use/hydric/>. Accessed February 2012.

2012b NRCS Soils Website. Available at <http://soils.usda.gov/>. Accessed February 2012.

2012c Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO). Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at <http://www.ncgc.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/ssurgo/>. Accessed February 2012.

2012d U.S. General Soil Map (STATSGO). Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at <http://www.ncgc.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/statsgo/description.html>. Accessed February 2012.

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
March 20, 2012
Page 13

Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Basin (RWQCB)

1995 *Water Quality Control Plan* for the Lahontan Basin (as amended). Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/references.shtml Accessed February 2012.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)

2012 The 303(d) List of Impaired Waterbodies. Available at: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/water_issues/programs/TMDLs/303dlist.shtml.

University of California at Davis (U.C. Davis)

2012a The Information Center for the Environment. Available at <http://ice.ucdavis.edu/>. Accessed February 2012.

2012b California Soil Resource Lab NRCS-NRCS SSURGO and STATSGO digital soil survey data. Available at <http://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/drupal/>. Accessed February 2012.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

2010 National Agricultural Imagery Program.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)

2012 Digital Watershed. Available at <http://www.iwr.msu.edu/dw/>. Accessed February 2012.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

2012 National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands Mapper. Available at: <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/>. Accessed February 2012.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

1973 7.5-minute Survey Mojave NE Quadrangle

2012a National Hydrography Dataset. Available at <http://nhd.usgs.gov/>. Accessed February 2012.

2012b Topographic Map Symbols. Available at <http://egsc.usgs.gov/isb/pubs/booklets/symbols/topomapsymbols.pdf>. Accessed February.

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC)

2012 Available at <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/>. Accessed February 2012.

ATTACHMENT A

**MAY 13, 2011 BARREN RIDGE JURISDICTIONAL
DELINEATION LETTER REPORT**

May 27, 2011

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
2151 Alessandro Drive, Suite 110
Ventura, CA 93001

Re: RE Barren Ridge 1 Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report and Request for an Approved Jurisdictional Determination

Dear Dr. Allen:

Introduction

This jurisdictional delineation letter report (JDLR) discusses the type and amount of potentially regulated aquatic resources occurring within the approximate 588-acre project survey area (the project survey area is also synonymous with the delineation survey area and the limits of the proposed development and construction) for the RE Barren Ridge 1 Photovoltaic Solar Electrical Generation Facilities project (project), which is proposed by Recurrent Energy, LLC.

As part of the environmental review process, this JDLR summarizes the latest federal and state guidance and methodologies employed in conducting a formal delineation for jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and State of California (state); the results of the fieldwork; and the amount, type, and location of the formally delineated potential jurisdictional waters occurring within the project area.

Summary

Based on the results of the formal field delineation within the project survey area it has been determined that there are 0.0^{1,2} acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S.^{3,4} and

¹ All acreages are rounded to the nearest hundredth (which may account for minor rounding error).

² Final acreages of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are based on the jurisdictional determination (JD) process per the March 30, 2007, *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination Form Instructional Guidebook*; the June 5, 2007, Approved JD Form; the June 5, 2007, Joint Guidance Memorandum; the December 2, 2008, Guidance Memorandum; and Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) 08-02 (if RGL 08-02 is deemed applicable and appropriate [i.e., the permit applicant or other "affected party" can decline to request and obtain an Approved JD and elect to use a Preliminary JD instead] for a jurisdictional determination of this formal jurisdictional delineation).

³ Final acreages of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are based on the JD process per the March 30, 2007, *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination Form Instructional Guidebook*; the June 5, 2007, Approved JD Form; the June 5, 2007, Joint Guidance Memorandum; the December 2, 2008, Guidance Memorandum; and RGL 08-02 (if RGL 08-02 is deemed applicable and appropriate [i.e., the permit applicant or other "affected party" can decline to request and obtain an Approved JD and elect to use a Preliminary JD instead] for nonbinding written indication that there may be waters of the U.S., including wetlands, on a parcel or indications of the approximate location[s] of waters of the U.S. or wetlands on a parcel). Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are relevant to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs), and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) regulatory permitting, if applicable.

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 2

approximately 6.62 acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the state, exclusively.^{5,6} Of these approximately 6.62 acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the state occurring within the survey area, approximately 0.65 acre is composed of alluvial fan scrub, approximately 3.21 acres are composed of unvegetated ephemeral dry wash, and approximately 2.76 acres are composed of unvegetated swale.

Purpose of Formal Jurisdictional Delineation

The purpose of performing a formal jurisdictional delineation is to identify the absence or presence (with their types, location, boundaries, and acreages) of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state (including wetlands) occurring within the project area. Once the presence or absence of potential jurisdictional waters is identified through this formal delineation, the results of this JDLR will be verified by the requisite federal and state agencies (e.g., the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE], the California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG], and the Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB]) of which these resource agencies will assert their regulatory administration over.⁷ This JDR is intended to support and provide agency documentation in the process of obtaining the following:

- Jurisdictional determination (JD) of “Geographic Isolation” (e.g., nonjurisdictional waters of the U.S.) or, if required, authorization under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (as regulated by USACE and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA]) (as applicable).⁸
- Certification of compliance under Section 401 of the CWA, (as regulated by the RWQCB [as applicable]).⁹
- Issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) or waiver under Article 4 of the 1969 Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act (Porter-Cologne) (as regulated by the RWQCB [as applicable]).¹⁰

⁴ Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are under the purview of USACE, with oversight by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the RWQCB (Lahontan Region 6). Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. include jurisdictional waters of the state. Federal and state jurisdictions do overlap but would remain distinct for regulatory administration and permitting purposes.

⁵ Relevant to CDFG and RWQCB permitting only.

⁶ Jurisdictional waters of the state are under the purview of CDFG, and the RWQCB. State jurisdictions often exceed, in lateral extent and area, federal jurisdiction. Therefore, jurisdictional waters of the state include jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (as applicable). Although federal and state jurisdictions do overlap, they would remain distinct for regulatory administration and permitting purposes.

⁷ Verification of the presence or absence of federal waters by USACE will be based on the findings outlined and presented in this JDLR and the Approved JD process (see below).

⁸ 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 230 (provided USACE determines that some or all of these delineated aquatic features occurring within the survey area present a significant nexus with the Pacific Ocean and are thus under federal jurisdiction as administered by USACE [which is anticipated not to be the case]).

⁹ Maintaining water quality standards under the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 would only apply to this project if it has been determined by USACE that some or all of these delineated waters occurring within the survey area are jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and that a discharge of waste would occur to or within jurisdictional waters of the U.S. If the USACE/USEPA determines that there are no jurisdictional waters of the U.S. occurring within the project area, then California Water Code Section 13000 *et seq.* (Porter-Cologne) would apply to any “discharge of waste” into state waters (see Discussion Section, below).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 3

- California Fish and Game Code (CFG) Chapter 6 Section 1600 *et seq.* (as regulated by the CDFG [as applicable¹¹]).

Project Location

The RE Barren Ridge 1 project site is located within the southeastern portion of Kern County, California, approximately 7 miles northwest of California City, California (Figures 1 and 2; all figures addressed herein are located in Attachment A). The southeastern portion of the project site is bisected by State Route 14 (SR-14), a transmission corridor easement that extends through the northwest corner of the site. Multiple service roads and trails, including Phillips Road (which is a compacted dirt service road), traverse throughout the project area (Figure 3).

Project Environmental Setting

The project site is located in Antelope Valley. The climate in this region is characterized by an arid environment with low humidity and rainfall, strong fluctuations in daily temperatures, hot summers and cold winters, and generally clear skies. Wind is also a strong feature of this climatic regime, with dry winds in excess of 25 miles per hour in the late winter and early spring. The climatological station closest to the RE Barren Ridge 1 project site that monitors temperature and precipitation is the Mojave Station (COOP ID: 045756)¹² The mean annual temperatures at the Mojave Station range from a minimum of 49.9 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) to a maximum of 75.8°F. Mean annual rainfall at the Mojave Station is approximately 5.93 inches (WRCC 2011).

The dominant floristic association within the project survey area corresponds to Mojave creosote bush scrub (Holland Code 34100 [Holland 1986]) or the creosote bush-white burr sage scrub Shrubland Alliance (Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf 2008). Small restricted stands of southern alluvial fan scrub¹³ (Holland Code 63330 [Holland 1986]) or the scale broom scrub Shrubland Alliance (Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf 2008) occur within the small ephemeral washes located at the westernmost portion and southeasternmost portion of the project survey area (Figure 4).

The two soil series occurring within the project survey area (Arizo Gravelly Loamy Sand and Cajon Loamy Sand) are within the entisol soil order (Figure 5). Entisols are geologically young soils primarily originating from sediments and alluvium that show little alteration of the parent material from which they were derived, and that exhibit little pedogenesis (soil formation process) (Brady 1990). Since entisols are primarily associated with fluvial processes and deposition (and to a lesser extent aeolian deposition), they are by nature dynamic and do not have the ability to develop buried soil horizons, which in turn contribute

¹⁰ If it is determined by USACE that no federal waters occur within the survey area or if no impact (discharge of dredge or fill) would occur to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. as a result of the proposed project.

¹¹ California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Division 1.

¹² The Mojave Station is located approximately 11.5 miles south of the project area located at 35.04917/-118.16194 (Decimal Degrees) (WRCC 2011).

¹³ The southern alluvial fan scrub occurring within the project survey area also closely corresponds to Mojave desert wash scrub (Holland Code 63700 [Holland 1986]).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 4

to in situ development of redoximorphic features when conditions are hydric over the appropriate temporal frame (NRCS 2011a; NRCS 2011b; USDA 1970).

The project area is located within the central-northern portion of the approximately 3,366-square-mile Antelope-Fremont Valleys Watershed (Hydrologic Unit Code: 18090206) and is located within the RWQCB Lahontan Region South Basin (RWQCB Region 6), the approximately 909-square-mile Fremont Hydrologic Unit (625.00) and the approximately 719-square-mile Koehn Hydrologic Area (625.40). There is no hydrologic subarea (Figure 6). There are no water bodies occurring within the project area that are listed on the CWA 303(d) List (impaired water bodies) (RWQCB 2011b).¹⁴

Elevation at the project survey area ranges between approximately 2,700 feet above sea level (asl) along the western portion to approximately 2,400 feet asl along the eastern portion. Topography is generally moderately sloping (ranging between 2% to 15% slopes) and undulating, with an eastern aspect. Based upon nearby elevation changes, located at the southeast extent of the Piute Mountains, an approximately 4,200-foot-high mountain feature called "Barren Ridge" creates an acute topographical divide. Through seasonal rainfall inputs this divide supports semideveloped limited ephemeral dry washes and swale features, which traverse the project survey area.

Specifically, within the project survey area, ephemeral washes are located within the central-west and southeastern portions. The central-west ephemeral wash flows from west to east prior to transforming into swale features. These swales cross under SR-14 via culverts and eventually form a confluence, through unnamed ephemeral tributaries, with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash (which is also an ephemeral wash tributary to Koehn Dry Lake [see below]) (USGS 2011a, 2011b). The southeast wash also forms a confluence with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash. The swales and swale complexes primarily occupy the western portion of the project survey area and flow from west to east and primarily abate into the landscape within the project survey area.¹⁵

Project Description

The proposed project consists of the development of a photovoltaic (PV) solar electrical generation facility. The facility would include PV panels mounted on steel and aluminum structures; solar substations; equipment pads; and associated infrastructure such as access roads, fencing, and tie-ins to adjacent power lines.

¹⁴ Section 303 of the CWA requires states (and tribes) to adopt water quality standards for all surface waters of the U.S. Additionally, Section 303 of the CWA requires states to identify and make a list of surface water bodies that are polluted (impaired). This list is referred to as the "303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments" (SWRCB 2011).

¹⁵ The confluence of the swales with Pine Tree Creek Wash and the abatement of swales into the landscape were confirmed by field delineation and groundtruthing efforts and conforms to the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) (USGS 2011a) and USGS mapping Survey (USGS) Mojave NE Quadrangle (1973) (USGS 2011b).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 5

Regulatory Framework

Aquatic environments/habitats occurring within California are regulated under the following federal and state laws:

Federal Regulations

USACE

Pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA, USACE is authorized to regulate any activity that would result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional waters of the U.S., which include those waters listed in 33 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 328 (Definitions). USACE, with oversight by USEPA, has the principal authority to issue CWA Section 404 Permits.

Pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCB certifies that any discharge into jurisdictional waters of the U.S. will comply with state water quality standards. The RWQCB, as delegated by USEPA, has the principal authority to issue a CWA Section 401 water quality certification or waiver.

State Regulations

CDFG

Pursuant to CFGC Section 1600 *et seq.* of the CDFG regulates activities of an applicant's project that would *substantially* alter the flow, bed, channel, or bank of streams or lakes unless certain conditions outlined by CDFG are met by the applicant. The limits of CDFG jurisdiction are defined in CFGC Section 1600 *et seq.* as the "bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream,¹⁶ or lake designated by the department in which there is at any time an existing fish or wildlife resource or from which these resources derive benefit."¹⁷ However, in practice, CDFG usually extends its jurisdictional limit and assertion to the top of a bank of a stream, the bank of a lake, or outer edge of the riparian vegetation, whichever is wider.

For desert aquatic features, CDFG provides specific guidance concerning their regulatory administration in California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 720 (Designation of Waters of Department Interest), which states:

For the purpose of implementing Sections 1601 and 1603 of the Fish and Game Code which requires submission to the department of general plans sufficient to indicate the nature of a project for construction by or on behalf of any person, governmental agency, state or local, and any public utility, of any

¹⁶ The California Code of Regulations (Title 14 CCR 1.72) defines a stream as "a body of water that flows at least periodically or intermittently through a bed or channel having banks and supports fish or other aquatic life. This includes watercourses having a surface or subsurface flow that supports or has supported riparian vegetation."

¹⁷ This also includes the habitat upon which they depend on for continued viability (California Fish and Game Code Division 5, Chapter 1, Section 45, and Division 2, Chapter 1, Section 711.2[a], respectively).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 6

project which will divert, obstruct or change the natural flow or bed of any river, stream or lake designated by the department, or will use material from the streambeds designated by the department, all rivers, streams, lakes, and streambeds in the State of California, including all rivers, streams and streambeds *which may have intermittent flows of water*, are hereby designated for such purpose (italics added).

RWQCB

Pursuant to Section 13000 *et seq.* of the California Water Code (CWC) (the 1969 Porter-Cologne), the RWQCB is authorized to regulate any activity that would result in discharges of waste and fill material into waters of the state, including “isolated” waters and wetlands. Waters of the state include any surface or groundwater within the boundaries of the state (CWC Section 13050[e]). Porter-Cologne authorizes the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to adopt, review, and revise policies for all waters of the state and directs the RWQCB to develop regional Basin Plans. CWC Section 13170 also authorizes the SWRCB to adopt water quality control plans on its own initiative. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (North and South Basins (RWQCB Region 6) (1995, as amended RWQCB 2011a) is designed to preserve and enhance the quality of water resources. The purpose of the plan is to designate beneficial uses of the surface and ground waters, designate water quality objectives for the reasonable protection of those uses, and establish an implementation plan to achieve the objectives within RWQCB Region 6.

Jurisdictional Delineation Methodology

Presurvey Investigations

Prior to conducting the field delineation for potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state (including wetlands), AECOM ecologist Joshua Zinn reviewed recent biological reports, historical land use of the project area, local and regional climactic data, and areas with topographical configurations and vegetative signatures occurring within the project area that may suggest the potential or presence of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state at the time of the field survey. This information was evaluated by consulting the following available sources:

- Biological Resource Assessment RE Kern County Desert Solar (Rincon 2011)
- 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Mojave NE Quadrangle (1973)
- National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) (USGS 2011a)
- 2010 Aerial Maps of the project area (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] National Agriculture Imagery Program [NAIP]) (USDA 2010)
- National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Interactive Wetlands Mapper (USFWS 2011)
- California Environmental Resources Evaluation System, California Wetlands Information System Wetland Databases and Inventories (CERES 2011)

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 7

- Information Center for the Environment (ICE) (U.C. Davis 2011a)
- NRCS Soils Website (NRCS 2011a)
- Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2011b)
- California Soil Resource Lab (U.C. Davis 2011b)
- Soil Survey of the Antelope Valley Area, California, (USDA 1970)
- California Watershed Portal (Cal/EPA 2011)
- California Watershed Network (CWN 2011)
- Office of Water Programs, Water Quality Planning Tool (CSUS 2011)
- Digital Watershed (USEPA 2011)
- Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC 2011)
- National Weather Service Climate Office (NOAA 2011)

Field Survey for Waters of the U.S.

On April 8, 2011, AECOM ecologist Joshua Zinn conducted a field survey and formal jurisdictional delineation of potentially regulated waters (including wetlands) within the project area.

All acquired field data were obtained by recording the presence (including extents, types, and boundaries) of potential jurisdictional waters using a Trimble XH subfoot accuracy handheld Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. All acquired field data were submitted to AECOM San Diego's geographic information systems (GIS) specialists for post-field processing. Post-field analysis, utilizing Trimble GPS Analyst (Version 2.1) GIS software, to code, define, designate, and edit all acquired GPS field data representing potential jurisdictional waters occurring within the project area, was conducted in tandem by an AECOM GIS specialist and the ecologist who performed the fieldwork.

The formal jurisdictional delineation and assessment of potentially regulated waters (including wetlands) were conducted within the project area and delineated pursuant to the guidance and criteria outlined in and in accordance with the following:

- 33 CFR 328 (Definition of Waters of the United States)
- Regulatory Guidance Letters (RGL) 88-06 and RGL 05-05
- *The Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987)

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 8

- The *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region* (Version 2.0) (2008 Regional Supplement) (Environmental Laboratory 2008)¹⁸
- *A Field Guide to the Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States: A Delineation Manual* (OHWM Manual) (USACE 2008)¹⁹
- *Distribution of Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) Indicators and Their Reliability in Identifying the Limits of "Waters of the United States" in Arid Southwestern Channels* (USACE 2006)
- *Review and Synopsis of Natural and Human Controls on Fluvial Channel Processes in the Arid West* (USACE 2007a)

It was determined through a pre-field survey, field reconnaissance, the formal delineation efforts, and post-field assessment, that the project area does not support hydrophytic vegetation or wetland hydrology. Therefore, the project survey area presents the potential for the presence of, at a minimum, one type of potentially federally regulated water, warranting the formal field delineation/assessment effort utilizing all relevant guidance and procedural documents (see above) for field indicators of all potential nonwetland waters of the U.S. (e.g., drainage features) and to define and identify the jurisdictional lateral extent of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM).²⁰

OHWM indicators were used to delineate the lateral jurisdictional extent of potential nonwetland waters of the U.S. Lateral jurisdictional limits were established for all drainage features/channels occurring within the project survey area in conjunction with field verification for a determination of the OHWM, which provides an acceptable estimate for the lateral jurisdictional limits. The OHWM of the drainage features/channels was identified on the basis of the following:

- Water marks within their respective channel banks established by the fluctuations of water and indicated by physical characteristics such as clear, natural lines impressed on the banks;
- Scour and shelving, local deposition, distinct and indistinct terraces, and changes in the character of soil;
- The presence of developed longitudinal bars within channel margins;

¹⁸ It should be noted that the OHWM Manual and 2008 Regional Supplement are guidance documents for delineating waters in the form of wetlands only. The portion of the delineated project area containing aquatic features utilized 2008 Supplement Data Forms to document the presence/absence of wetland but not the presence of *jurisdictional waters* in the form of wetland and/or ordinary high water mark (OHWM) or "other waters" of the U.S.

¹⁹ Datasheets from this field delineation manual were used as guidance documents for this delineation and are not included in this Jurisdictional Delineation Report.

²⁰ 33 CFR 328.3(e); RGL 88-06; RGL 05-05; and USACE OHWM field manuals (USACE 2006; 2007a; 2008).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 9

- Type, abundance, and relative age of vegetation and/or destruction of terrestrial vegetation, and the presence and absence of litter and debris within the ephemeral channels;
- Ephemeral channel configuration, estimated streamflow behavior, and other subtle geomorphic evidence indicative of regular flow levels;
- Consideration of precipitation patterns and lack of consistent flow;
- Geomorphic OHWM indicators (e.g., surface relief, cobblebars, benches, crested ripples, particle size distribution, mudcracks, gravel sheets, desert pavement, and dunes); and
- Pattern and location of relictual channels and discontinuous drainage features.

The criteria for frequency and duration of the OHWM have not been defined under the CWA or under any guidance from USACE for field delineators; therefore, identifiable field indicators and characteristics of OHWM, best professional judgment, interpretation of 33 CFR 328.3(e), and appropriate RGLs were applied to determine the potential jurisdictional extent of OHWM within the project survey area. Fluvial channels occurring within the arid western region of the U.S. have recently been described as “ordinary” when they typically correspond to a 5- to 8-year event and typically have an active floodplain with sparse vegetation cover, shifts in soil texture, and occasional alignment with distinctive bed and bank features (USACE 2007a). However, modeling has shown that slightly larger events (5- to 10-year recurrence) may be necessary to engage the active floodplain in arid systems (USACE 2006).

OHWM and the limits of jurisdiction are discussed in the preamble to the USACE November 13, 1986, Final Rule, Regulatory Programs of the Corps of Engineers, Federal Register Volume 51, No. 219, page 41217, which discusses the proper interpretation of 33 CFR Part 328.4 (c)(1) as follows:

Section 328.4: *Limits of Jurisdiction*. Section 328.4 (c)(1) defines the lateral limit of jurisdiction in nontidal waters as the OHWM provided that the jurisdiction is not extended by the presence of wetlands. Therefore, it should be concluded that in the absence of wetlands the upstream limit of Corps jurisdiction also stops when the OHWM is no longer perceptible.

In addition, RGL 88-06, issued June 27, 1988, discussed the OHWM as follows:

OHWM: The OHWM is the physical evidence (shelving, debris lines, etc.) established by normal fluctuations of water level. For rivers and streams, the

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 10

OHWM is meant to mark the within-channel high flows, not the average annual flood elevation that generally extends beyond the channel.²¹

RGL 05-05, issued December 7, 2005, discusses the field practice and practicability of identifying, determining, and applying the OHWM for nontidal waters under Section 404 of the CWA (and under Sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899), and states the following:

Where the physical characteristics are inconclusive, misleading, unreliable, or otherwise not evident, districts may determine OHWM by using other appropriate means that consider the characteristics of the surrounding areas, provided those other means are reliable.²² Such other reliable methods that may be indicative of the OHWM include, but are not limited to, lake and stream gage data, elevation data, spillway height, flood predictions, historic records of water flow, and statistical evidence.

Many stream channels in arid regions are dry for much of the year and, at times, may lack hydrology indicators entirely or exhibit relic OHWM features from exceptional hydrological events. RGL 05-05 further states the following:

When making OHWM determinations, districts should be careful to look at characteristics associated with ordinary high water events, which occur on a regular or frequent basis. Evidence resulting from extraordinary events, including major flooding and storm surges, is not indicative of OHWM. For instance, a litter or wrack line resulting from a 200-year flood event would in most cases not be considered evidence of an OHWM.

Jurisdictional Determination for Potential Waters of the U.S.

All waters delineated within the project area are considered as “Geographically Isolated” waters (e.g., potential nonjurisdictional waters of the U.S. [including final acreages and types]).²³ Prior to an Approved or Preliminary JD performed by USACE (with potential oversight by USEPA depending on the relationship of the delineated feature toward traditionally navigable waters [TNW]). The final JD may remove portions of delineated waters from being considered as jurisdictional and/or may include additional waters not initially considered as jurisdictional during the field delineation (and, thus, not included in this JDLR).

²¹ Following RGL 05-06 (Expired RGLs). Unless superseded by specific provisions of subsequently issued regulations or RGLs, the guidance provided in RGLs generally remains valid after the expiration date as discussed in the Federal Register (FR) notice on RGLs of March 22, 1999, FR Vol. 64, No. 54, page 13783.

²² In some cases, the physical characteristics may be misleading and would not be reliable for determining the OHWM. For example, water levels or flows may be manipulated by human intervention for power generation or water supply. For such cases, districts should consider using other appropriate means to determine the OHWM (RGL 05-05).

²³ 33 CFR 328.3(a)(3).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 11

Determining whether the delineated nonwetland waters occurring within the project site are in fact nonjurisdictional and outside the regulatory administration of USACE, including the final acreages and types of jurisdictional waters occurring within the project area, is primarily based on the procedural changes and guidance outlined by the following:

- a. The June 5, 2007, USACE/USEPA Memorandum Re: Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court Decision In *Rapanos v. United States* on the interpretation of the *Rapanos* Supreme Court case for making a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) for waters of the U.S. (including wetlands) (USEPA/USACE).^{24,25} This memorandum provides guidance to USEPA and USACE on implementing the *Rapanos* Supreme Court decision.
- b. The June 5, 2007, USEPA/USACE Memorandum for the Field: Coordination on JDs under the CWA in light of *SWANCC* and *Rapanos* Supreme Court decisions.²⁶ This memorandum outlined procedures that replace the coordination procedures contained in the January 2003 USEPA/USACE guidance implementing the *SWANCC* decision (but leaves the remainder of that guidance unaffected) and articulates new coordination procedures for JDs affected by *Rapanos* (USEPA/USACE).²⁷
- c. The May 5, 2007, *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination Form Instructional Guidebook* (USACE 2007b) and the Approved JD Form.
- d. The June 5, 2007, USACE RGL 07-01. Practices for Documenting Jurisdiction under CWA Section 404 (and Rivers and Harbors Act CWA Sections 9 & 10) This RGL provides coordination requirements for Approved JDs and outlines a consistent approach for making, documenting, and approving JDs in a timely manner by USACE. This RGL also outlines the differences between Approved JDs and Preliminary JDs.
- e. The January 28, 2008, Coordination Memorandum. This memorandum outlined the process for coordinating JDs with USEPA and USACE.
- f. The June 26, 2008, USACE RGL 08-02. This RGL primarily explains the goals of a Preliminary JD and differences between Approved JDs and Preliminary JDs. This RGL provides guidance on when an Approved JD is required and when a landowner, permit applicant, or other "affected party" can decline to request and obtain an Approved JD and elect to use a Preliminary JD instead.^{28,29} This RGL also outlines

²⁴ "Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in *Rapanos v. United States & Carabell v. United States*" (June 5, 2007).

²⁵ 126 S. Ct 2208 (2006). This case was consolidated with *Carabell v. United States*.

²⁶ "Memorandum for Director of Civil Works and US EPA Regional Administrators" (June 5, 2007).

²⁷ "Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in *Rapanos v. United States & Carabell v. United States*" (June 5, 2007).

²⁸ Generally, approved JDs should be used to support individual permit applications, but applicants should be made aware of their option to elect to use a Preliminary JD wherever applicants feel doing so is in their best interest (RGL 08-02 [paragraph 4(h)]).

²⁹ RGL 08-02 (paragraph 4) outlines that Preliminary JDs cannot be appealed.

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 12

that it is the goal of USACE that every JD requested by an affected party should be completed within 60 calendar days of receiving the request.³⁰

- g. The December 2, 2008, USACE Guidance Memorandum Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in *Rapanos v. United States* and *Carabell v. United States*. This guidance incorporates revisions to the USEPA/USACE Memorandum originally issued on June 6, 2007, after careful consideration of public comments received and based on the agencies' experience in implementing the *Rapanos* decision.
- h. The December 2, 2008, USACE Response to Comments "Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the Supreme Court's Decision in *Rapanos v. United States* & *Carabell v. United States* Guidance" issued June 5, 2007.
- i. The December 2, 2008, USACE Questions and Answers Regarding the Revised *Rapanos* & *Carabell* Guidance.

As of this writing, this jurisdictional delineation presents 0.0 acre of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. The final acreages of jurisdictional waters of the U.S., delineated within the project survey area will be based on the JD process per the USACE/USEPA Guidance and procedure for *Rapanos* (see above). For this particular jurisdictional delineation, the formal procedure for obtaining a JD (for a formal determination by the USACE/USEPA of nonjurisdictional waters [e.g., Geographically Isolated waters]) requires the submittal of a completed Approved JD, following federal guidance, as applicable, to the USACE (Los Angeles District, South Coast Branch) (Attachment B).³¹

Based on the results of the delineation and federal guidance outlined above, this JDLR was prepared to provide support to USACE in making a formal determination of all waters delineated within the project survey area that are determined to be isolated waters and thus not regulated by USACE for the following reasons:

1. All ephemeral washes delineated within the project survey area eventually form a confluence with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash, which is a tributary to Koehn Dry Lake. Koehn Dry Lake has been determined by USACE to be an isolated nonjurisdictional water of the U.S. (Attachment C).
2. Abatement into the landscape and the lack of hydrological connectivity of the ephemeral washes into a Relatively Permanent Waterway (RPW) and the lack of hydrological connectivity of the ephemeral washes into a RPW connected by storm drains or culverts.
3. The lack of hydrological connectivity (presenting a significant nexus [SNX] to any TNW) for washes occurring within the disturbance area.

³⁰ RGL 08-02 (paragraphs 4[a] and 5[a])

³¹ The USACE district engineer retains the discretion to use an Approved JD in any other circumstance where he or she determines that it is appropriate given the facts of the particular case (RGL 08-02 [4][c]).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 13

4. The evaluation of the ephemeral washes not presenting an SNX to a TNW includes the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water to a TNW.
5. Examination of the flow characteristics and functions of ephemeral washes (which do not support adjacent wetlands) has been determined not to present a significant effect on the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of downstream TNWs.
6. Lack of an ecological connection to TNWs. The ephemeral washes present low to no potential or capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon (vital to support downstream foodwebs [e.g., macroinvertebrates] present in headwater streams or to convert carbon in leaf litter making it available to species downstream), nor do these ephemeral washes present habitat services such as providing spawning areas for recreationally or commercially important species in downstream waters.
7. Ephemeral washes delineated within the project survey area abate into the landscape and become both continuous and discontinuous swale features.
8. The swales and swale complexes occurring within the project survey area, while unvegetated, occur within the larger Mojave creosote bush scrub habitat. The swales are generally poorly defined surface aquatic features characterized by low volume, infrequent or short-duration flow and are usually shallow topographical features in the landscape that *may* convey water across upland areas during and following uncommon large storm events. Swales are generally not considered jurisdictional waters of the U.S. because they lack an identifiable OHWM, are not tributaries themselves, or they do not have a significant nexus to TNWs (e.g., the Pacific Ocean).³²

Field Survey for Waters of the State

Potential jurisdictional waters of the state were assessed and delineated within the project area pursuant to CFGC Section 1600 *et seq.* (and other relevant guidance and regulatory applicability [see above]). Boundaries for ephemeral wash and southern alluvial fan scrub (xeric riparian) waters of the state were determined (and recorded) by the presence of shelving and/or scour resulting in an established bank, bed, or channel of an ephemeral wash feature and its associated xeric riparian areas (where applicable). In specific areas within the small underdeveloped ephemeral wash channel, where evidence of shelving or scour was absent, subsurface investigations were undertaken to identify established channel banks. Although some portions of the ephemeral wash presented shelving with smooth-toe transitions, these features are composed of friable sand and are evidence of recent sand deposition (both from fluvial- and aeolian-related events) covering the bank features.

Based on the CFGC Section 1600 *et seq.* definition, relevant state regulations (see above), CDFG regulatory practice, and past CDFG field guidance; swale features (individual and

³² Even when not considered a jurisdictional water of the U.S. or state, swales may still contribute to a surface hydrologic connection between an upland and aquatic features. However, such hydrological connections are dependent on large, uncommon storm events.

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 14

complexes) occurring within the project area were also noted, delineated, and recorded as potential jurisdictional waters of the state.³³

For wetlands and other aquatic habitats occurring in California, CDFG relies on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) wetland definition and classification system, which is based on *Classification of Wetland and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin et al. 1979). Therefore, jurisdictional wetland delineations within the RE Barren Ridge 1 site were conducted based on the one-parameter³⁴ method outlined in CDFG/USFWS guidance documents and classification manual(s) to define presence and state jurisdictional extent.³⁵ The Cowardin method requires diligence to avoid false positive conclusions (e.g., concluding that an area with no transitional relation to the aquatic system is a wetland based on presence of vegetation equally likely to be found in wetland or nonwetland circumstances).³⁶

Results

The findings for each potential jurisdictional water were recorded during the formal field delineation within the project survey area (Table 1).

Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.

The extent and distribution of the collective area of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. occurring within the project area is 0.0 acre (Figure 7; see above and also Footnote 2 pertaining to the JD process). Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are listed for each aquatic habitat in Table 1. Aquatic-related habitats have been classified according to both the *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California* (Holland 1986) and *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin et al. 1979). Both classification systems incorporate a hierarchical structure of systems, subsystems, and classes to identify vegetation communities, wetland habitat types, and cover types. The vegetation occurring within the project area is typically associated with desert scrub ecosystems occurring within this vicinity of California.

Jurisdictional Waters of the State

The extent and distribution of the collective area of potential jurisdictional waters of the state occurring within the project area is approximately 6.62 acres (Figure 7). Jurisdictional waters of the state are also listed for each aquatic habitat in Table 1.

³³ Swales are microtopographic features that convey surface water in low volume and short duration (hours to days [usually in sheetflow]) and are commonly associated with riverine features (Hauer and Lamberti 2007).

³⁴ For federal jurisdictional waters, a determination for the presence of wetland is based on the presence of three parameters occurring simultaneously at the area of investigation and study: (1) hydrophytic vegetation, (2) hydric soils, and (3) wetland hydrology. Therefore, for state-defined wetlands, only one of these three wetland criteria is required to be present for the state to consider an aquatic feature a wetland.

³⁵ It should be noted that CDFG does not currently have a delineation manual for jurisdictional waters of the state (including wetlands).

³⁶ Although aquatic features can be delineated and defined as wetlands under the Cowardin Classification System, they are not necessarily *jurisdictional* waters of the U.S. or state.

Table 1
Summary of Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. and State
Occurring within the Project Area^{a,b}

Type of Potential Jurisdictional Waters	Type of Habitat (Holland 1986)	Type of Habitat (Cowardin et al. 1979)	Acres	Linear Feet	Regulatory Authority
Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Subtotal Potential Waters of the U.S.</i>			<i>0.0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	
Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the State					
Xeric Riparian Extent	Southern Alluvial Fan Scrub Channel (Holland Code 63330)	Palustrine; Scrub/Shrub, Broad-Leaved, Evergreen, Intermittently Flooded/ Temporary, Well Drained/Fresh, Alkaline	0.65	155	CDFG and RWQCB
Unvegetated Ephemeral Dry Wash	Nonvegetated Floodplain or Channel (Holland Code 64200)	Riverine; Intermittent; Unconsolidated Bottom, Sand, Intermittently Flooded, Alkaline	3.21	1,008	CDFG and RWQCB
Unvegetated Swale	Mojave Creosote Bush Scrub (Holland Code 34100) ^c	Mojave Creosote Bush Scrub is not considered an aquatic habitat by Cowardin ^d	2.76	20,015	CDFG and RWQCB
<i>Subtotal Potential Waters of the State</i>			<i>6.62</i>	<i>21,178</i>	
Grand Total Potential Jurisdictional Waters			6.62	21,178	

^a Based on the total area of potential jurisdictional waters delineated within the RE Barren Ridge 1 site.
^b Acreage of all jurisdictional waters was determined by using the GIS program ArcGIS. All acreages are rounded to the nearest hundredth after summation, which may account for minor rounding error.
^c Although swales are unvegetated they are within the larger Mojave creosote bush scrub habitat.
^d Swales are microtopographic features that convey surface water in low volume and short duration (hours to days [usually in sheetflow]) and are commonly associated with riverine features (Hauer and Lamberti 2007).

Photo locations and representative photos taken during the field delineation are included in Figures 8 through 13.

Discussion

Avoidance and Minimization of Potential Impacts

If the proposed project will result in impacts to jurisdictional waters of the state then avoidance and minimization measures to jurisdictional waters of the state will require implementation through project design and will be employed during the construction process to avoid and minimize potential impacts to jurisdictional aquatic features to the greatest practicable extent feasible.

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 16

Potential Impacts and Requisite Permitting

If it is determined that anticipated unavoidable impacts (permanent and temporary) will occur to jurisdictional waters of state as a result of this proposed project then issuance of the following state permits will be required.

Requisite Permitting

CFGC Section 1600 et seq. Permitting

By submitting a Notification for a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) to the appropriate CDFG field office (South Coast Region), CDFG will ascertain which (or all) of the delineated aquatic features occurring within the project area will be under its regulatory administration. The SAA Notification process also allows CDFG to determine whether aquatic features will become “substantially adversely affected” under CFGC Section 1602(a), and to provide guidance on requisite and appropriate compensatory mitigation for any unavoidable impacts to these aquatic resources as a result of the proposed project.

As a requirement of the SAA, the development of a conceptual mitigation, maintenance, and monitoring plan would be required for creation, restoration, or enhancement mitigation, which is a requirement of the SAA. This plan should include details regarding site preparation (e.g., grading), planting specifications, and irrigation design, as well as maintenance and monitoring procedures. The plan should outline yearly success criteria and remedial measures should the mitigation effort fall short of the success criteria. Any appropriate mitigation that cannot be achieved through on-site creation-restoration and enhancement should be performed off-site, typically per agency guidance within the same hydrologic unit (watershed) where impacts occur. Alternatively, the mitigation obligations may also be satisfied by participating in a fee-based mitigation program through an approved mitigation bank. Any proposed mitigation is subject to the resource agencies’ review and discretion; thus, the mitigation obligations for the impacts to jurisdictional aquatic habitats may change from those recommended here.

Project compliance with state policy, i.e., California Wetlands Conservation Policy (EO W-59-93), provides for “no overall net loss” of wetlands and achieving a “long-term net gain in the quantity, quality, and permanence of wetlands acreage and values in California.” Therefore, a minimum 1:1 mitigation ratio would be applied toward any impacts to jurisdictional waters of the state. Project-specific mitigation ratios would be developed in consultation with CDFG.³⁷

CWC Section 13000 et seq. (Porter-Cologne) Waste Discharge Requirement (or Waiver)

The RWQCB regulates the “discharge of waste” to waters of the state.³⁸ The definition of the waters of the state is broader than that for waters of the U.S. in that all waters are

³⁷ Many desert aquatic resources, such as southern alluvial fan scrub, lack the characteristic features of a wetland but still perform wetland functions (USACE 2007).

³⁸ “Waters of the state” is defined in CWC Section 13050(e).

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 17

considered to be a water of the state regardless of circumstances or condition. The term “discharge of waste” is also broadly defined in Porter-Cologne, such that discharges of waste include fill, any material resulting from human activity, or any other “discharge” that may directly or indirectly impact waters of the state. As conditional to this permit, best management practices (BMPs) will be required to ensure compliance with state water quality standards. BMPs can also be specified by the RWQCB, based on the report of waste discharge (ROWD) (filed with the appropriate RWQCB by the applicant), which is authorized to regulate discharges of waste and fill material to waters of the state (including “isolated” waters and wetlands), through the issuance of a WDR.³⁹ WDRs are commonly issued based on the threshold of allowable pollutants into waters of the state.

Under Porter-Cologne, all applicants proposing to discharge waste that could affect the quality of waters of the state, other than into a community sewer system, shall file with the appropriate RWQCB an ROWD containing such information and data as may be required by the RWQCB.⁴⁰ The RWQCB will then respond to the ROWD by issuing a WDR in a public hearing, or by waiving WDRs (with or without conditions) for that proposed discharge. The RWQCB has a statutory obligation to prescribe WDRs, except where the RWQCB finds that a waiver (with or without conditions) of WDRs for a specific type of discharge is in the public interest.⁴¹ Therefore, all parties proposing to discharge waste that could affect waters of the state, but do not affect federal waters (which requires authorization under CWA Section 404 and certification under CWA Section 401) must file an ROWD with the appropriate RWQCB prior to issuance of the WDR.⁴² The ROWD/WDR is also subject to the resource agencies’ review and discretion for BMPs and mitigation.

Sincerely,



Joshua Zinn
Ecologist and Regulatory Specialist

cc: Seth Israel, Recurrent Energy
Charity Wagner, Urban Planning Partners

Attachment A – Figures:

- Figure 1 – Regional Map
- Figure 2 – Project Vicinity
- Figure 3 – Survey Area
- Figure 4 – Vegetation Communities
- Figure 5 – Soils
- Figure 6 – Watersheds
- Figure 7 – Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the State

³⁹ CWC Section 13263.

⁴⁰ CWC Section 13260(a).

⁴¹ CWC Section 13269.

⁴² CWC Section 13260.

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 18

Figure 8 – Photopoint Locations

Figure 9 – Representative Photographs 1 and 2

Figure 10 – Representative Photographs 3 and 4

Figure 11 – Representative Photographs 5 and 6

Figure 12 – Representative Photographs 7 and 8

Figure 13 – Representative Photographs 9 and 10

Attachment B – Approved JD Form

Attachment C – Approved JD Letter for Beacon Solar, LLC

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 19

References

- Brady, N.C.
1990 *The Nature and Property of Soils*, 10th ed., Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.
- California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA)
2011 California Watershed Portal (CWP). Available at <http://cwp.resources.ca.gov/>. Accessed March.
- California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES)
2011 Available at <http://www.ceres.ca.gov/>. Accessed March.
- California Watershed Network (CWN)
2011 Available at <http://www.watershednetwork.org/>. Accessed March.
- California State University Sacramento (CSUS) Office of Water Programs.
2011 Available at <http://www.owp.csus.edu/research/stormwatertools/>. Accessed March.
- Cowardin, L., V. Carter, F. Golet, and E. LaRoe
1979 *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. U.S. Department of Interior. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-79/31. December 1979.
- Environmental Laboratory
1987 *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*. Technical Report Y-87-1. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. Vicksburg, Mississippi.
2008 *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0)*. September.
- Hauer, Richard and Gary A. Lamberti (editors)
2007 *Methods in Stream Ecology*. Second Edition. London: Academic Press.
- Holland, R. F.
1986 *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California*. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
2011 Available at <http://forecast.weather.gov/MapClick.php?CityName=Plaster+City&state=CA&site=PSR&textField1=32.7925&textField2=-115.858&e=0>

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 20

Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)

2011a NRCS Soils Website. Available at <http://soils.usda.gov/>. Accessed April.

2011b NRCS Web Soil Survey. Available at websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/. Accessed April.

Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin (RWQCB)

2011a *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region North and South Basins*. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/references.shtml. Accessed April.

2011b CWA Section 303(d) *List of Water Quality Limited Segments*. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/index.shtml. Accessed April.

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

2011 *RE Kern County Desert Solar Biological Resources Assessment*. January.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)

2011 Total Maximum Daily Load Program. Available at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/303d_lists.shtml. Accessed April.

Sawyer, J. O., and T. Keeler-Wolf

2008 *A Manual of California Vegetation*. Second Edition. California Native plant Society in association with the California Department of Fish and Game.

U.C. Davis

2011a The Information Center for the Environment. Available at <http://ice.ucdavis.edu/>.

2011b California Soil Resource Lab. Available at <http://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/drupal/>.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

2006 *Distribution of Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) Indicators and Their Reliability in Identifying the Limits of "Waters of the United States" in Arid Southwestern Channels*. USACE ERDC/CRREL TR-08-12.

2007a *Review and Synopsis of Natural and Human Controls on Fluvial Channel Processes in the Arid West* USACE ERDC/CRREL TR-07-16.

2007b *The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination Form Instructional Guidebook*. Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. May.

Aaron Allen, PhD., North Coast Branch Chief
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-RE Barren Ridge 1
May 27, 2011
Page 21

2008 *A Field Guide to the Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States: A Delineation Manual*. Engineering Research and Development Center. August.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

1970 Soil Survey of the Antelope Valley Area, California. Natural Resources Conservation Service, University of California Agricultural Experiment Station.

2010 National Agricultural Imagery Program.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)

2011 Digital Watershed. Available at <http://www.iwr.msu.edu/dw/>.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

2011 National Wetlands Inventory Interactive Wetlands Mapper. Available at <http://www.nwi.fws.gov>.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

2011a National Hydrography Dataset. Available at <http://nhd.usgs.gov/>. Accessed April.

2011b Topographic Map Symbols. Available at <http://egsc.usgs.gov/isb/pubs/booklets/symbols/topomapsymbols.pdf>. Accessed April.

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC)

2011 Western US COOP Station Map. Available at <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?ca2713>. Accessed April.

ATTACHMENT A
FIGURES



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011





Figure 1
Regional Map

Recurrent Energy - Barren Ridge Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR Regional Map.mxd, 5/11/2011, IrelandM



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011




Figure 2
Vicinity Map



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011





Figure 3
Survey Area



LEGEND

- Unvegetated Ephemeral Wash 3.21 acres
- Mojave Desert Wash Scrub (Xeric Riparian Extent) 0.65 acre
- Swale 2.76 acres
- Creosote Bush-White Burr Sage Scrub 587.55 acres
- Barren Ridge Boundary

Source: AECOM 2011; Recurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011

750 375 0 750 Feet

Scale: 1 = 9,000; 1 inch = 750 feet

Figure 4
Vegetation Communities



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011; SSURGO 2008





Figure 5
Soils



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011; CalWater 2008





Figure 6
Watersheds



Source: AECOM 2011; Recurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011

750 375 0 750 Feet

Scale: 1 = 9,000; 1 inch = 750 feet

*For all delineated desert aquatic features no formal Jurisdictional Determination with the USACE has been pursued at this time. When a formal Jurisdictional Determination is pursued with the USACE it is anticipated that all delineated aquatic features will be considered as 'Geographically Isolated' and therefore nonjurisdictional waters of the U.S. by the USACE (and USEPA).

**Map features not to scale. Acreages are accurate and based on digitized field notes.

Figure 7
Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the State*




Figure Figure 8
Photopoint Locations



Photograph 1: Looking northwest at unvegetated swale feature.



Photograph 2: Looking southeast at unvegetated swale feature.

Figure 9
Representative Photographs 1 and 2



Photograph 3: Looking southeast at unvegetated swale feature.



Photograph 4: Looking east at unvegetated swale feature.

Figure 10
Representative Photographs 3 and 4



Photograph 5: Looking south at unvegetated ephemeral dry wash.



Photograph 6: Looking west at ephemeral dry wash supporting Mojave Desert wash scrub. Note *Lepidospartum squamatum* occurring within wash.

Figure 11
Representative Photographs 5 and 6



Photograph 7: Looking east at unvegetated ephemeral dry wash just below end of Mojave Desert wash scrub.



Photograph 8: Looking east at terminus of unvegetated ephemeral dry wash where the wash transforms into a swale complex feature.

Figure 12
Representative Photographs 7 and 8



Photograph 9: Looking east at unvegetated swale feature below the terminus of the unvegetated ephemeral dry wash.



Photograph 10: Looking southeast at unvegetated swale feature.

Figure 13
Representative Photographs 9 and 10

ATTACHMENT B
APPROVED JD FORM

**APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Los Angeles District Regulatory Division, Los Angeles Section, South Coast Branch

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Barren Ridge PV Solar Project. Please refer to Introduction, Summary, Project Location, and Project Description located in the Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report (JDLR).

State: CA County/parish/borough: Kern City: N/A (site is located approximately 7 miles northwest of California City, CA):

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat: 35.204486 Long: -118.068574

Universal Transverse Mercator: 11n 402737.21 mE 3896225.57 mN

Name of nearest waterbody: Koehn Dry Lake

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: N/A

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Antelope-Fremont Valleys Watershed (HUC18090206)

Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request (Please refer to Figures 7 through 13 of the JDLR. Please see the attached Waters Upload Sheet (page 9 of this form)

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:

Field Determination. Date(s): April 8, 2011

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: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on:

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): N/A

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³

Potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. were assessed and delineated within the project survey area (please see Figure 3 in the JDLR) and determined not to be federally jurisdictional waters under the regulatory administration of the USACE.

Explain: Ephemeral streams present geographic isolation with no hydrological or ecological surface connection to a TNW. Ephemeral streams occurring within the project survey area either abate into the landscape or form a confluence with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash which is a tributary to Koehn Dry Lake. Using the criteria outlined in 33 CFR 328.3 the USACE has determined that Koehn Dry Lake exhibits insufficient evidence of interstate commerce to meet the requirements of 33 CFR 328.3(a)(3)(iii) and does not meet the requirements for navigability at 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1). Therefore aquatic features within the immediate vicinity and that form a confluence with Koehn Dry Lake are not subject to USACE jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

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.

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

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

Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **pick list**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Stable. An established vegetated drainage feature.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **pick list**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope):

(c) **Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **pick list**

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **pick list** Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **pick list**. Explain findings:

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: | |

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

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

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

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

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.

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: Vernal pool.
 Wetland quality. Explain:
 Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Intermittent Flow**. 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: Clear with some turbidity from sediment.
 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:
 Approximately acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)	Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)
-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

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

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

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

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-RPWs⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

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

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

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

⁸ See Footnote #3.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:

- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW

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

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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

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

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

- Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or
- Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
- Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):¹⁰

- which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
- from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
- which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
- Interstate isolated waters. Explain:
- Other factors. Explain:

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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.

Based on the results of the delineation and federal guidance outlined above, this JDLR was prepared to provide support to USACE in making a formal determination of all waters delineated within the project survey area that are determined to be isolated waters and thus not regulated by USACE for the following reasons:

1. All ephemeral washes delineated within the project survey area eventually form a confluence with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash, which is a tributary to Koehn Dry Lake. Koehn Dry Lake has been determined by USACE to be an isolated nonjurisdictional water of the U.S. (Attachment C).
2. The lack of hydrological connectivity of the ephemeral washes into a Relatively Permanent Waterway (RPW), storm drains, culverts, or ditches (no storm drains are present within the disturbance area).
3. The lack of hydrological connectivity (presenting a significant nexus [SNX] to any TNW) for washes occurring within the disturbance area.
4. The evaluation of the ephemeral washes not presenting an SNX to a TNW includes the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water to a TNW.
5. Examination of the flow characteristics and functions of ephemeral washes (which do not support adjacent wetlands) has been determined not to present a significant effect on the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of downstream TNWs.
6. Lack of an ecological connection to TNWs. The ephemeral washes present low to no potential or capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon (vital to support downstream foodwebs [e.g., macroinvertebrates] present in headwater streams or to convert carbon in leaf litter making it available to species downstream), nor present habitat services such as providing spawning areas for recreationally or commercially important species in downstream waters.
7. Ephemeral washes delineated within the project survey area abate into the landscape and become both continuous and discontinuous swale features.
8. The swales and swale complexes occurring within the project survey area, while unvegetated, occur within the larger Mojave creosote bush scrub habitat. The swales are generally poorly defined surface aquatic features characterized by low volume, infrequent or short-duration flow and are usually shallow topographical features in the landscape that *may* convey water across upland areas during and following uncommon large storm events. Swales are generally not considered jurisdictional waters of the U.S. because they lack an identifiable OHWM, are not tributaries themselves, or they do not have a significant nexus to TNWs (e.g., the Pacific Ocean).

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): 1163 linear feet, 2-65 width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
- Wetlands:

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): 1163 linear feet, 2-65 width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters:
- List type of aquatic resource:

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: Refer to the Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report (JDLR).
- 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: 7.5 Mojave NE Quadrangle (1973).
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Web Soil Survey and Soil Survey of the Antelope Valley Area (USDA 1970).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: N/A.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):

- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): USDA NAIP 2010.
or Other (Name & Date): Please see Figures 8 through 13 in the JDLR (field photographs)

- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: Corps File No. 2007-1414-CLM (please see Attachment C of the JDLR).
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
 Other information (please specify): Refer to 'Waters Upload Sheet' provided on page 9 of this form.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Please see the JDLR and Attachment C of the JDLR.

WATERS UPLOAD SHEET FOR ISOLATED EPHEMERAL WASHES OCCURRING AT THE BARREN RIDGE PV SOLAR PROJECT SITE

Figure in JDLR	Project Area	Waters Name	Cowardin Code	HGM Code	Area (acres)	Waters Types	Latitude	Longitude	Local Watershed	Hydrologic Unit
7	Barren Ridge	Ephemeral Wash	R4SB4	Riverine	3.18	Isolated	33.202627	-118.076048	Koehn Hydrologic Area	Antelope-Fremont Valleys
7	Barren Ridge	Ephemeral Wash	R4SB4	Riverine	0.68	Isolated	35.197512	-118.060744	Koehn Hydrologic Area	Antelope-Fremont Valleys

ATTACHMENT C

APPROVED JD LETTER FOR BEACON SOLAR, LLC



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
LOS ANGELES DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
VENTURA FIELD OFFICE
2151 ALESSANDRO DRIVE, SUITE 110
VENTURA, CALIFORNIA 93001

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

February 5, 2008

Office of the Chief
Regulatory Division

Kenneth Stein
Beacon Solar, LLC
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, Florida 33408

Dear Mr. Stein:

Reference is made to your letter (Corps File No. 2007-1414-CLM), dated November 5, 2007 for a Department of the Army Jurisdictional Determination to construct a wind power generation project in unnamed tributaries to Koehn Dry Lake within an unincorporated area of Kern County, California.

Based on the information furnished in your letter, we have determined that Kohn Dry Lake does not exhibit any evidence of navigation. Using the criteria at 33 CFR Part 328.3, the Corps has determined that Koehn Dry Lake exhibits insufficient evidence of interstate commerce to meet the requirements of 33 CFR Part 328.3(a)(3)(iii) and does not meet the requirements for navigability at 33 CFR Part 328.3 (a)(1). Based on the above information and the Solid Waste Agency of Northern County Supreme Court Decision, your project does not discharge dredged or fill material into a water of the United States or an adjacent wetland. Therefore, the project is not subject to our jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and a Section 404 permit is not required from our office.

Please be aware that our determination does not preclude the need to comply with Section 13260 of the California Water Code (Porter/Cologne) and we recommend that you contact the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to insure compliance with the above regulations. Furthermore, our determination does not obviate the need to obtain other Federal, state, or local authorizations required by law.

This letter contains an approved jurisdictional determination for the Beacon Street Solar Energy Project. 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 C) 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, CESPDPDS-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. Part 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 April 6, 2008. 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 Crystal L. Marquez at the letterhead address by April 6, 2008. 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.

A courtesy copy of this letter has been sent to Mr. Joshua Zinn, EDAW Inc., 1420 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 500, San Diego, CA 92101. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Crystal L. Marquez at (805) 585-2143. Please be advised that you can now comment on your experience with Regulatory Division by accessing the Corps web-based customer survey form at: <http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>.

Sincerely,



Antal Szijj
Senior Project Manager
North Coast Branch

Enclosures

ATTACHMENT B

**JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FOR RE BARREN RIDGE
1 PHOTOVOLTAIC SOLAR ELECTRICAL GENERATION
FACILITIES PROJECT (FILE NO. SPL-2011-00511-BAH)**



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

VENTURA REGULATORY FIELD OFFICE
2151 ALESSANDRO DRIVE, SUITE 110
VENTURA, CA 93001

October 13, 2011

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

Regulatory Division

Joshua Zinn
AECOM
1420 Kettner Blvd, Suite 500
San Diego, California 92101

SUBJECT: Jurisdictional determination for RE Barren Ridge 1 Photovoltaic Solar Electrical Generation Facilities Project

Dear Mr. Zinn:

I am responding to your request (File No. SPL-2011-00511-BAH) dated May 27, 2011 for a jurisdictional determination for the RE Barren Ridge 1 Photovoltaic Solar Electrical Generation Facilities Project located approximately 7 miles northwest of California City, Kern County, California. As you are aware, the Corps' determination of jurisdiction assesses whether or not the proposed project is located within or contains a water of the United States, and whether or not the proposed project includes an activity potentially regulated under Section 10 of the River and Harbor Act or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. If either test is not met, a Department of the Army permit would not be required.

The project area includes several minor ephemeral drainages, primarily in the western portion of the project area, most of which diminish to swale conformation on the landscape. These drainages eventually drain to ephemeral tributaries to Pine Tree Creek dry wash, which is an ephemeral tributary to Koehn Dry Lake to the east. A second wash feature, also an ephemeral tributary to Pine Tree Creek dry wash, occurs in the extreme southeastern corner of the property on the east side of Highway 14. The various drainages within the project area comprise approximately 6.62 acres, of which you identified 5.97 acres to be essentially unvegetated dry wash or unvegetated swale. Based on the information you provided in your request and our prior knowledge of the project area, we have determined the RE Barren Ridge 1 Photovoltaic Solar Electrical Generation Facilities Project site does not contain waters of the United States pursuant to 33 C.F.R. §325.9 and a Department of the Army permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act is not required.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 805-585-2145 or via e-mail at Bruce.A.Henderson@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: <http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bruce Henderson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "B".

Bruce Henderson
Sr. Project Manager
North Coast Branch
Regulatory Division

ATTACHMENT C

FIGURES



Source: RE Barren Ridge One 2011; ESRI 2011





Figure 1
Regional Map

RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Tie-Line JDLR

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR_Gen-Tie\BR Gen-Tie Regional Map.mxd, 3/15/2012, irelandm



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011




Figure 2
Vicinity Map

RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Tie-Line JDLR

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR_Gen-Tie\BR Gen-Tie Vicinity Map.mxd, 2/14/2012, irelandm



Source: AECOM 2011; RE Barren Ridge One 2011; Microsoft 2010




Figure 3
Survey Area

RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Tie-Line JDLR

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR_Gen-Tie\BR Gen-Tie Study Area.mxd, 2/14/2012, irelandm





Figure 4.
Vegetation Communities

Source: AECOM 2011; RE Barren Ridge One 2011; Microsoft 2010

RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Tie-Line JDLR

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR_Gen-Tie\BR Gen-Tie Vegetation Communities.mxd, 3/20/2012, irelandm



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011; SSURGO 2008





Figure 5
Soils

RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Tie-Line JDLR

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR_Gen-Tie\BR Gen-Tie Soils.mxd, 2/14/2012, irelandm



Source: Concurrent Energy 2011; ESRI 2011; CalWater 2008




Figure 6
Watersheds

RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Tie-Line JDLR

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR_Gen-Tie\BR Gen-Tie Watersheds.mxd, 3/15/2012, irelandm




Figure 7. Potential Jurisdictional Waters of the State

Source: AECOM 2011; RE Barren Ridge One 2011; Microsoft 2010

RE Barren Ridge Photovoltaic Electrical Generation Facilities Tie-Line JDLR

Path: P:\2011\11280215.01_Recurrent_PV\06GIS\6.3_Layout\JDR\BR_Gen-Tie\BR Gen-Tie Wetlands.mxd, 3/20/2012, irelandm



Photograph 1-Looking east at unvegetated ephemeral dry wash.



Photograph 2-Looking east at swale complex within Mojave creosote bush scrub.

Figure 8
Representative Photographs 1 and 2



Photograph 3-Looking southeast at southern alluvial fan scrub. Note scalebroom (*Lepidospartum squamatum* [which is a wash dependant shrub]) occupying washes.



Photograph 4-Looking northwest at southern alluvial fan scrub.

Figure 9
Representative Photographs 3 and 4

ATTACHMENT D
APPROVED JD FORM

**APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Los Angeles District Regulatory Division, Los Angeles Section, South Coast Branch

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Barren Ridge PV Solar Project. Please refer to Introduction, Summary, Project Location, and Project Description located in the Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report (JDLR).

State: CA County/parish/borough: Kern City: N/A (site is located approximately 7 miles northwest of California City, CA):

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat: 35.229456 Long: -118.058824

Universal Transverse Mercator: 11n 403668.83 mE 3898990.40 mN

Name of nearest waterbody: Pine Tree Creek (to Koehn Dry Lake)

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: N/A

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Antelope-Fremont Valleys Watershed (HUC18090206)

Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request (Please refer to Figures 7 through 13 of the JDLR. Please see the attached Waters Upload Sheet (page 9 of this form) and the Electronic Waters Upload Sheet (provided separately)

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:

Field Determination. Date(s): February 9, 2012

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: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on:

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): N/A

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³

Potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. were assessed and delineated within the project survey area (please see Figure 3 in the JDLR) and determined not to be federally jurisdictional waters under the regulatory administration of the USACE.

Explain: Ephemeral streams present geographic isolation with no hydrological or ecological surface connection to a TNW. Ephemeral streams occurring within the project survey area either abate into the landscape or form a confluence with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash which is a tributary to Koehn Dry Lake. Using the criteria outlined in 33 CFR 328.3 the USACE has determined that Koehn Dry Lake exhibits insufficient evidence of interstate commerce to meet the requirements of 33 CFR 328.3(a)(3)(iii) and does not meet the

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

requirements for navigability at 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1). Therefore aquatic features within the immediate vicinity and that form a confluence with Koehn Dry Lake are not subject to USACE jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

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

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

Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **pick list**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Stable. An established vegetated drainage feature.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **pick list**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope):

(c) **Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **pick list**

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **pick list** Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **pick list**. Explain findings:

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: | |

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

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

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

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

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.

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: Vernal pool.
 Wetland quality. Explain:
 Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Intermittent Flow**. 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: Clear with some turbidity from sediment.
 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:
 Approximately acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)	Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)
-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

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

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

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

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-RPWs⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

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

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

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

⁸ See Footnote #3.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:

- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW

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

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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

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

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

- Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or
- Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
- Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):¹⁰

- which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
- from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
- which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
- Interstate isolated waters. Explain:
- Other factors. Explain:

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

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

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

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

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.

Based on the results of the delineation and federal guidance outlined above, this JDLR was prepared to provide support to USACE in making a formal determination of all waters delineated within the project survey area that are determined to be isolated waters and thus not regulated by USACE for the following reasons:

1. All ephemeral washes delineated within the project survey area eventually form a confluence with the Pine Tree Creek dry wash, which is a tributary to Koehn Dry Lake. Koehn Dry Lake has been determined by USACE to be an isolated nonjurisdictional water of the U.S. (Attachment C).
2. The lack of hydrological connectivity of the ephemeral washes into a Relatively Permanent Waterway (RPW), storm drains, culverts, or ditches (no storm drains are present within the disturbance area).
3. The lack of hydrological connectivity (presenting a significant nexus [SNX] to any TNW) for washes occurring within the disturbance area.
4. The evaluation of the ephemeral washes not presenting an SNX to a TNW includes the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water to a TNW.
5. Examination of the flow characteristics and functions of ephemeral washes (which do not support adjacent wetlands) has been determined not to present a significant effect on the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of downstream TNWs.
6. Lack of an ecological connection to TNWs. The ephemeral washes present low to no potential or capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon (vital to support downstream foodwebs [e.g., macroinvertebrates] present in headwater streams or to convert carbon in leaf litter making it available to species downstream), nor present habitat services such as providing spawning areas for recreationally or commercially important species in downstream waters.
7. Ephemeral washes delineated within the project survey area abate into the landscape and become both continuous and discontinuous swale features.
8. The swales and swale complexes occurring within the project survey area, while unvegetated, occur within the larger Mojave creosote bush scrub habitat. The swales are generally poorly defined surface aquatic features characterized by low volume, infrequent or short-duration flow and are usually shallow topographical features in the landscape that *may* convey water across upland areas during and following uncommon large storm events. Swales are generally not considered jurisdictional waters of the U.S. because they lack an identifiable OHWM, are not tributaries themselves, or they do not have a significant nexus to TNWs (e.g., the Pacific Ocean).

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): 1440 linear feet, 2-65 width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
- Wetlands:

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): 1440 linear feet, 2-65 width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters:
- List type of aquatic resource:

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: Refer to the Jurisdictional Delineation Letter Report (JDLR).
- 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: 7.5 Mojave NE Quadrangle (1973).
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Web Soil Survey and Soil Survey of the Antelope Valley Area (USDA 1970).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: N/A.

- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): USDA NAIP 2010.
or Other (Name & Date): Please see Figures 8 through 9 in the JDLR (field photographs)

- Previous determination(s). Jurisdictional Determination for RE Barren Ridge 1 Photovoltaic Solar Electrical Generation facilities Project (File No. SPL-2011-00511-BAH) (please see Attachment B of the Barren Ridge T-Line JDLR) and File no. and date of response letter: Corps File No. 2007-1414-CLM.
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): Refer to 'Waters Upload Sheet' provided on page 9 of this form and the Electronic Waters Upload Sheet (provided separately)

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Please see the Attachments A, B, C, and D of the JDLR.

WATERS UPLOAD SHEET FOR ISOLATED EPHEMERAL WASHES OCCURRING AT THE BARREN RIDGE PV SOLAR PROJECT SITE

Figure in JDLR	Project Area	Waters Name	Cowardin Code	HGM Code	Area (acres)	Waters Types	Latitude	Longitude	Local Watershed	Hydrologic Unit
7	Barren Ridge Tie-Line	Ephemeral Wash	R6	Riverine	0.92	Isolated	35.229456	-118.058824	Koehn Hydrologic Area	Antelope-Fremont Valleys
7	Barren Ridge Tie-Line	Alluvial Fan Scrub	R6	Riverine	1.01	Isolated	35.229456	-118.058824	Koehn Hydrologic Area	Antelope-Fremont Valleys

