

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): 16 November 2022

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: CENWP-ODG, Verde Light Solar, NWP-2022-290

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Oregon County/parish/borough: Malheur City: Ontario

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 44.036112°, Long. -117.003516°.

Universal Transverse Mercator: N/A

Name of nearest waterbody: Dork Canal

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Snake River

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Malheur River, 170501170603

☒ 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: 28 October 2022

☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are no** “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]

☐ Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

☐ Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.
Explain: .

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are** “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: Dork Canal.

☐ 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: Dork Canal: 1,050 linear feet: 45 width (ft) and/or 0.38 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: Wetland 1, Wetland 2, Wetland 3, Wetland 4, Wetland 5. Ditch 1, Ditch 2, Ditch 3, Ditch 4. See Section III F for additional information.

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:** Dork Canal

Watershed size: 22,254.71 **acres**

Drainage area: 5715.2 **acres**

Average annual rainfall: 9 inches

Average annual snowfall: 13 inches

(ii) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) **Relationship with TNW:**

☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.

☒ Tributary flows through **2** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **1 (or less)** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **1 (or less)** river miles from RPW.

Project waters are **1-2** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are **1-2** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

Identify flow route to TNW⁵:

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.

Dork Canal: The Dork Canal flows through the southern boundary of the Review Area and then 1.9 miles to the northeast whereupon it flows into the Snake River.

Tributary stream order, if known: N/A.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):

Tributary is: ☐ Natural
☒ Artificial (man-made). Explain: Dork Canal: The Dork Canal is a historic irrigation canal that delivers water from a diversion of the Malheur River originating directly east of the city of Vale. The Dork Canal is primarily an open channel feature reinforced with levees on either side. The Dork Canal flows along the southern boundary of the Review Area.

☐ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

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

Average width: 35 feet

Average depth: N/A.

Average side slopes: **2:1**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

<input checked="" 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: Banks are reinforced with 3ft-6ft levees.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): <1 %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20 (or greater)**

Describe flow regime: Perennial.

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Confined**. Characteristics: Tributary banks are reinforced with 3ft-6ft levees within the Review Area. Two downstream segments of the tributary are piped.

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings:

☐ Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks	
<input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank	<input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris
<input checked="" 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;

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

- ☐ physical markings/characteristics ☐ vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
☐ tidal gauges
☐ 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: .

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:

Wetland type. Explain:

Wetland quality. Explain:

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain:

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .

☐ Dye (or other) test performed: .

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

- ☐ Directly abutting
☐ Not directly abutting
☐ Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: .
☐ Ecological connection. Explain: .
☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: .

Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):

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

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

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:

Dork Canal: Aerial imagery over multiple years shows visible surface flow in the Dork Canal from the Review Area to where it flows into the Snake River.

- ☐ 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: 1,050 linear feet; 35 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 within the review area (check all that apply):

☐ Tributary waters: . linear feet . width (ft).

☐ Other non-wetland waters: . acres.

Identify type(s) of waters: .

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

- ☐ Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.

☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.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.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹ To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

¹⁰ Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

- ☐ 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: .
- ☒ Other: (explain, if not covered above):

Wetland 1: Wetland 1 is a 0.39 acre palustrine emergent wetland belonging to the Depressional Closed Nonpermanent (DCNP) hydrogeomorphic (HGM) sub classification. Hydrologic input for Wetland 1 is provided primarily through a lateral of the Dork Irrigation Canal with secondary inputs from Wetland 4 and from precipitation (average rainfall of 9 inches). The lateral of the Dork Irrigation Canal terminates at Malheur Drive with no surface connection to downstream waters. Areas which do not receive irrigation water on the eastern portion of the Review area are characteristic of uplands indicating that Wetland 1 would revert to uplands if irrigation were removed. Historical U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topography maps as early as 1951 do not show any vegetated areas nor natural drainages within the Review area, other than the constructed Dork Canal and the Union Drain (A Drainage Ditch). Wetland 1 is sparsely vegetated (at least 5 percent cover) and did not meet the dominance test hydrophytic vegetation indicator or the prevalence index hydrophytic vegetation indicator. The nearest waterway is the Dork Canal which is approximately 85 linear feet away, however, there is a rise in topography which prevents the wetland from flowing towards the ditch. The mapped soil type is Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil. Umapine characteristics include a slope of 0 to 2 percent, a restrictive layer at more than 80 inches, and is somewhat poorly drained. The capacity of the most restrictive limiting layer to transmit water (ksat) is 0.57 to 1.98 in/hr. Hydrology is confined within the wetland due to topographical restraints and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Oregon Compass imagery does not map amphibians within the Review Area. Wetland 1 is not located within the 100-year floodplain. Wetland 1 lacks an interstate commerce connection, is not used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational purposes, and lacks habitat, resources, birds, wildlife of special significance which would attract interstate travelers. The Corps determined that Wetland 1 meets the definition of "Preamble Waters" defined in the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (51 FR, Page 41217), Part 328 as artificially irrigated areas which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased. The Corps has determined Wetland 1 is a non-jurisdictional wetland.

Wetland 2: Wetland 2 is a 0.66 acre palustrine emergent wetland belonging to the DCNPHGM sub classification. Hydrologic input for Wetland 2 is provided primarily through a lateral of the Dork Irrigation Canal with secondary inputs from precipitation (average rainfall of 9 inches). Areas which do not receive irrigation water on the eastern portion of the Review Area are characteristic of uplands indicating that Wetland 2 would revert to uplands if irrigation were removed. Historical USGS topography maps as early as 1951 do not show any vegetated areas nor natural drainages within the Review area, other than the constructed Dork Canal and the Union Drain (A Drainage Ditch). Wetland 2 is sparsely vegetated exhibiting no Obligate (OBL) or Facultative Wetland (FACW) species. The nearest waterway is the Dork Canal which is approximately 750 linear feet away, however, there is a rise in topography which prevents the surface runoff from continuing to flow north, and there is a berm/levee approximately 3ft in height preventing surface water flow to the Union Drain/A Drainage Ditch during extreme events. The mapped soil type is Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil. Umapine characteristics include a slope of 0 to 2 percent, a restrictive layer at more than 80 inches, and is somewhat poorly drained. The capacity of the most restrictive limiting layer to transmit water (ksat) is 0.57 to 1.98 in/hr. Hydrology is confined within the wetland due to topographical restraints and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Oregon Compass imagery does not map amphibians within the Review Area. Wetland 2 is not located within the 100-year floodplain. Wetland 2 lacks an interstate commerce connection, is not used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational purposes, and lacks habitat, resources, birds, wildlife of special significance which would attract interstate travelers. The Corps determined that Wetland 2 meets the definition of "Preamble Waters" defined in the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (51 FR, Page 41217), Part 328 as artificially irrigated areas which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased. The Corps has determined Wetland 2 is a non-jurisdictional wetland.

Wetland 3: Wetland 3 is a 0.05 acre palustrine emergent wetland belonging to the Depressional Closed Nonpermanent (DCNP) hydrogeomorphic (HGM) sub classification. Hydrologic input for Wetland 3 is provided primarily through surface runoff from Wetland 4 (Wetland 4 hydrology is provided by a lateral of the Dork Irrigation Canal) with secondary inputs from annual precipitation (9 inches). Areas which do not receive irrigation water on the eastern portion of the Review Area are characteristic of uplands indicating that Wetland 3 would revert to uplands if irrigation were removed. Historical USGS topography maps as early as 1951 do not show any vegetated areas nor natural drainages within the Review area, other than the constructed Dork Canal and the Union Drain (A Drainage

Ditch). Wetland 3 is sparsely vegetated exhibiting no Obligate (OBL) or Facultative Wetland (FACW) species. The nearest waterway is the Dork Canal which is approximately 75 linear feet to the south, however, the topography has a natural rise towards the south preventing surface water flow in that direction. Additionally, there is a berm/levee approximately 5ft in height preventing surface water flow to the Dork Canal during extreme events. The mapped soil type is Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil. Umapine characteristics include a slope of 0 to 2 percent, a restrictive layer at more than 80 inches, and is somewhat poorly drained. The capacity of the most restrictive limiting layer to transmit water (ksat) is 0.57 to 1.98 in/hr. Hydrology is confined within the wetland due to topographical restraints and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Oregon Compass imagery does not map amphibians within the Review Area. Wetland 3 is not located within the 100-year floodplain. Wetland 3 lacks an interstate commerce connection, is not used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational purposes, and lacks habitat, resources, birds, wildlife of special significance which would attract interstate travelers. The Corps determined that Wetland 3 meets the definition of "Preamble Waters" defined in the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (51 FR, Page 41217), Part 328 as artificially irrigated areas which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased. The Corps has determined Wetland 3 is a non-jurisdictional wetland.

Wetland 4: Wetland 4 is a 0.12 acre palustrine emergent wetland belonging to the Riverine Impounding (RI) hydrogeomorphic (HGM) sub classification. Hydrologic input for Wetland 4 is provided primarily by a lateral of the Dork Irrigation Canal with secondary input from annual precipitation (9 inches). Areas which do not receive irrigation water on the eastern portion of the Review Area are characteristic of uplands indicating that Wetland 4 would revert to uplands if irrigation were removed. Historical USGS topography maps as early as 1951 do not show any vegetated areas nor natural drainages within the Review area, other than the constructed Dork Canal and the Union Drain (A Drainage Ditch). Wetland 4 is sparsely vegetated (at least 5 percent cover) and did not meet the dominance test hydrophytic vegetation indicator or the prevalence index hydrophytic vegetation indicator. The nearest waterway is the Dork Canal which is approximately 45 linear feet to the south, however, the topography has a natural rise towards the south preventing flow in that direction. Additionally, there is a berm/levee approximately 5ft in height preventing surface water flow to Dork Canal during extreme events. The mapped soil type is Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil. Umapine characteristics include a slope of 0 to 2 percent, a restrictive layer at more than 80 inches, and is somewhat poorly drained. The capacity of the most restrictive limiting layer to transmit water (ksat) is 0.57 to 1.98 in/hr. Hydrology is confined within the wetland due to topographical restraints and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Oregon Compass map does not map amphibians in the area. Wetland 4 is not located within the 100-year floodplain. Wetland 4 lacks a significant connection to any downstream waters. Wetland 4 lacks an interstate commerce connection, is not used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational purposes, and lacks habitat, resources, birds, wildlife of special significance which would attract interstate travelers. The Corps determined that Wetland 4 meets the definition of "Preamble Waters" defined in the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (51 FR, Page 41217), Part 328 as artificially irrigated areas which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased. The Corps has determined Wetland 4 is a non-jurisdictional wetland.

Wetland 5: Wetland 5 is a 0.01 acre palustrine emergent wetland belonging to the Depressional Closed Nonpermanent (DCNP) hydrogeomorphic (HGM) sub classification. Hydrologic input for Wetland 5 is provided primarily through surface runoff from Wetland 4 with secondary inputs from annual precipitation (9 inches) and possible seepage from a lateral of the Dork Irrigation Canal. Areas which do not receive irrigation water on the eastern portion of the review area are characteristic of uplands indicating that Wetland 5 would revert to uplands if irrigation were removed. Historical USGS topography maps do not show any vegetated areas nor natural drainages within the Review Area, other than the artificial Dork Canal and the Union Drain (A Drainage Ditch). Wetland 5 vegetation included crabgrass, curvseed butterwort, curly dock, and slender wheatgrass, however, no Obligate (OBL) or Facultative Wetland (FACW) species were observed. The nearest waterway is the Dork Canal which is approximately 65 linear feet to the south, however, the topography has a natural rise towards the south preventing flow in that direction. Additionally, there is a berm/levee approximately 5ft in height preventing surface water flow to Dork Canal during extreme events. The mapped soil type is Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil. Umapine characteristics include a slope of 0 to 2 percent, a restrictive layer at more than 80 inches, and is somewhat poorly drained. The capacity of the most restrictive limiting layer to transmit water (ksat) is 0.57 to 1.98 in/hr. Hydrology is confined within the wetland due to topographical restraints and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Oregon Compass map does not map amphibians in the area. Wetland 5 lacks a significant connection to any downstream waters. Wetland 5 lacks an interstate commerce connection, is not used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational purposes, and lacks habitat, resources, birds, wildlife of special significance which would attract interstate travelers. The Corps determined that Wetland 5 meets the definition of "Preamble Waters" defined in the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (51 FR, Page 41217), Part 328 as artificially irrigated areas which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased. The Corps has determined Wetland 5 is a non-jurisdictional wetland.

Ditch 1: Ditch 1 is an irrigation canal which is solely intended to carry water from a lateral of the Dork canal. The soils where Ditch 1 is located are mapped as Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil type. Based on soil surveys and historical topographic maps, Ditch 1 was excavated in uplands. Hydrology is confined within the Review Area and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Ditch 1 lacks a surface or shallow sub-surface connection to a non-RPW, RPW, or Traditionally Navigable Water. In accordance with the preamble to the 1986 Regulatory Definition of Waters of the U.S., irrigation ditches excavated on dry land are generally not considered waters of the US. The Corps has determined Ditch 1 is a non-jurisdictional water.

Ditch 2: Ditch 2 is an irrigation canal which is solely intended to carry water from a lateral of the Dork canal. The soils where Ditch 2 is located are mapped as Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil type. Based on soil surveys and historical topographic maps, Ditch 2 was excavated in uplands. Hydrology is confined within the Review Area and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Ditch 2 lacks a surface or shallow sub-surface connection to a non-RPW, RPW, or Traditionally Navigable Waters. In accordance with the preamble to the 1986 Regulatory Definition of Waters of the U.S., irrigation ditches excavated on dry land are generally not considered waters of the US. The Corps has determined Ditch 2 is a non-jurisdictional water.

Ditch 3: Ditch 3 is an irrigation canal which is solely intended to carry water from a lateral of the Dork canal. The soils where Ditch 3 is located are mapped as Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil type. Based on soil surveys and historical topographic maps, Ditch 3 was excavated in uplands. Hydrology is confined within the Review Area and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Ditch 3 lacks a surface or shallow sub-surface connection to a non-RPW, RPW, or Traditionally Navigable Waters. In accordance with the preamble to the 1986 Regulatory Definition of Waters of the U.S., irrigation ditches excavated on dry land are generally not considered waters of the US. The Corps has determined Ditch 3 is a non-jurisdictional water.

Ditch 4: Ditch 4 is an irrigation canal which is solely intended to carry water from a lateral of the Dork canal. The soils where Ditch 4 is located are mapped as Umapine Silt Loam, a non-hydric soil type. Based on soil surveys and historical topographic maps, Ditch 4 was excavated in uplands. Hydrology is confined within the Review Area and is either absorbed into the groundwater or evaporates. Ditch 4 lacks a surface or shallow sub-surface connection to a non-RPW, RPW, or Traditionally Navigable Waters. In accordance with the preamble to the 1986 Regulatory Definition of Waters of the U.S., irrigation ditches excavated on dry land are generally not considered waters of the US. The Corps has determined Ditch 4 is a non-jurisdictional water.

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

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

- ☐ Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet, width (ft).
☐ Lakes/ponds: acres.
☒ Other non-wetland waters: Ditch 1: 1,890 Linear Feet (LF); Ditch 2: 480 LF; Ditch 3: 600 LF, Ditch 4: 1,080 LF; .
☒ Wetlands: Wetland 1: 0.39 acre; Wetland 2: 0.66 acre; Wetland 3: 0.05 acre; Wetland 4: 0.12 acre; Wetland 5: 0.01 acre.

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: *Wetland Delineation Report for Verde Light Solar USDA Environmental Assessment*, May 2022, Prepared for the City of Fleet Development, LLC
☒ 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: Corps EGIS, last accessed 26 August 2022.
☒ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Corps EGIS, last accessed 26 August 2022.
☒ USGS NHD data.
☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: OR Malheur Butte 1951, 2020, 24K / ID Payette 2020, 24K.
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey, last accessed 26 August 2022.
☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Corps EGIS, last accessed 26 August 2022.
☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
☒ FEMA/FIRM maps: Oregon Department of Mining and Minerals Industries (DOGAMI) HazVu tool supporting FEMA/FIRM data, last accessed 12 August 2022.
☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): Oregon Statewide Aerial Imagery Download.
 or ☒ Other (Name & Date): Site photos submitted in *Wetland Delineation Report for Verde Light Solar USDA Environmental Assessment*, May 2022, Prepared for the City of Fleet Development, LLC.
☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
☐ Applicable/supporting case law: .
☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
☒ Other information (please specify): Oregon DOGAMI Bare Earth Slope LiDAR and, Antecedent Precipitation Tool (USACE) software (v1.0.20) last accessed 08 July 2022.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The Dork Canal is a historic irrigation canal that delivers water from a diversion of the Malheur River originating directly east of the city of Vale. The Review Area is bordered by the Union Drain (A Drainage Ditch) to the north and the Dork Canal to the south. Upslope laterals of the Dork Canal to the west of the Review Area provide gravity irrigation to the wetlands and ditches within Review Area. The Review Area has been mechanically manipulated to support artificial ponding and grazing through periodic flood irrigation. The Corps determined that Wetlands 1-5 lack a significant nexus to any downstream waters, and meet the definition of "Preamble Waters" defined in the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (51 FR, Page 41217), Part 328 as artificially irrigated

areas which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased are not considered waters of the US. The Corps determined that Ditches 1-4 lack a significant nexus to any downstream waters, and meet the definition of "Preamble Waters" defined in the November 13, 1986 Federal Register (51 FR, Page 41217), Part 328 as being irrigation ditches excavated in uplands are generally not considered waters of the US.

On 4 November 2022, the Corps initiated coordination for the review of this AJD with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10 and Corps Headquarters (HQ). On 10 November 2022, the EPA concurred with our determination. On 16 November 2022, Corps HQ responded with no comments.