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): October 24, 2012
- B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Denver Regulatory Office, Bucking Horse Development, NWO-2012-2145-DEN
- C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: CO County/parish/borough: Larimer City: Fort Collins

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 40.563213 N; Long. -105.037610 W

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Spring Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: none

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 10190007

Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.

Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc...) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: September 6, 2012

Field Determination. Date(s): September 5, 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.

9	Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):	1
а.	multate di escrice di waters di U.S. in review area (Check an that abbiv).	

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: Pick List

Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

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

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: Several wetlands are located on the property. All wetlands on the site are either isolated or exist as a result of construction activities or artificial irrigation. All wetlands on-site are considered non-jurisdictional. See Section III.F. below for further explanation.

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.

SEC	JIIC	DN III: CWA ANALYSIS
F.		N-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements. Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce. Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR). Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: Other: (explain, if not covered above): A small 0.01 acre wetland to the northwest boundary of the property exists due to the presence of a
		small spring. Water from the spring daylights and then quickly dissipates into the ground. The spring and wetland are surrounded by upland and are not surface connected or adjacent to another aquatic resource. The closest water of the U.S. is Spring Creek, 1,300 feet to the north. This wetland is considered isolated with no nexus to interstate commerce. There is no information available to show that this wetland 1) is or could be used by interstate or foreign travlers for recreational or other
		purposes, 2) produces fish or shellfish which are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce, or 3) is or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in the interstate commerce.
		On-site are wetlands that have developed due to drain tile piping from adjacent farm land to the southeast that spills onto the construction site. These wetlands are artificially irrigated and would cease to exist if the irrigation stopped. Wetlands have also developed along a roadside ditch that traps surface water runoff. Reference is made to the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (Page 41217), Part 328 (a) non-tidal drainage and irrigation ditches excavated on dry land, and (b) artificially irrigated area which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased,. The Corps of Engineers generally does not consider these types of aquatic resources waters of the U.S. except on a case by-case basis. In this case, these wetlands are not considered jurisdictional.
	pres	wide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e. sence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all apply): Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft). Lakes/ponds: acres. Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: Wetlands: Small Spring wetland 0.01 acre
	find	vide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a ling is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply): Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet, width (ft). Lakes/ponds: acres. Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: . Wetlands: acres.
SEC	CTIC	ON IV: DATA SOURCES.
A		PORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and lested, appropriately reference sources below): Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Cedar Creek Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report. Data sheets prepared by the Corps: Corps navigable waters' study: U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: USGS NHD data. USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: 1:24000, Fort Collins USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
		State/Local wetland inventory map(s): FEMA/FIRM maps: 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929) Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): or Other (Name & Date): Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: Applicable/supporting case law: Rapanos and Carabell cases. Applicable/supporting scientific literature: Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Site Photo

