

**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): 11/10/2021**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: CENWW-BOI, NWW-2021-00570**

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: ID County/parish/borough: Blaine City: Hailey  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): 43.624° Lat. -114.293° Long.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 11, Northing 718401, Easting 4833673  
Name of nearest waterbody: East Fork Wood River  
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Snake River (RM 445.5)  
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 170402190505, Peters Gulch- East Fork Big Wood River  
 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: 11/9/2021  
 Field Determination. Date(s): N/A

**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):<sup>1</sup>**

- TNWs, including territorial seas  
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs  
 Relatively permanent waters<sup>2</sup> (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

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

<sup>2</sup> 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).

**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: 0.92 acres.

**c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

**2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):<sup>3</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: A non-wetland ditch historically excavated within the property was identified. This feature may have been utilized historically to provide flow/drainage between parcels however it appears to have been abandoned and terminates in physical form on adjacent landowner's property prior to connecting to the Wood River. This ditch was identified to be 120 linear feet in length.

**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 waterbody<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>3</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>4</sup> Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

**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: HUC 12; 35.89 square miles  
Drainage area: 80.34 square miles  
Average annual rainfall: Precipitation Totals (PRIZM) 25.8 inches  
Average annual snowfall:

**(ii) Physical Characteristics:**

**(a) Relationship with TNW:**

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through **3** tributaries before entering TNW.  
Project waters are **30 or more** river miles from TNW.  
Project waters are **1 or less** river miles from RPW.  
Project waters are **30 or more** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.  
Project waters are **1 or less** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.  
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A  
Identify flow route to TNW<sup>5</sup>: East Fork Wood Flows flows to the Big Wood River, which flows through a series of diversions, before flowing into the Malad River Gorge, as a tributary to the Snake River. The Snake River is a TNW at RM 445.5  
Tributary stream order, if known: 4

**(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):** The East Fork Wood River is located outside the review area, however general characteristics of the tributary are listed where known.

**Tributary is:**  Natural  
 Artificial (man-made). Explain:  
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

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

Average width: 30-50 feet  
Average depth: Varies  
Average side slopes: Varies

**Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):**

- Silts
- Sands
- Concrete
- Cobbles
- Gravel
- Muck
- Bedrock
- Vegetation. Type/% cover:
- Other. Explain:

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Generally Stable  
Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: Unknown  
Tributary geometry: Relatively Straight  
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 2 %

**(c) Flow:**

Tributary provides for: Perennial Flow  
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: 2-5 (estimated)  
Describe flow regime: The East Fork Wood River is a perennial waterway, that flows relatively permanently. Surficial Flow into the wetland complex occurs during high water, and shallow subsurface flow likely occurs seasonally.  
Other information on duration and volume:  
Surface flow is: Characteristics:

<sup>5</sup> 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.

Subsurface flow: . Explain findings:

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks

OHWM<sup>6</sup> (check all indicators that apply):

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank  the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil  destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving  the presence of wrack line
- vegetation matted down, bent, or absent  sediment sorting
- leaf litter disturbed or washed away  scour
- sediment deposition  multiple observed or predicted flow events
- water staining  abrupt change in plant community:
- other (list):

Discontinuous OHWM.<sup>7</sup> Explain:

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

- High Tide Line indicated by:  Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
- oil or scum line along shore objects  survey to available datum;
- fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)  physical markings;
- 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: Unknown, however the Tributary is fully supporting Assessed Beneficial Uses of Cold Water Aquatic Life, and Secondary Contact Recreation (IDEQ Status Report 2018/2020) Identify specific pollutants, if known: N/A

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

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): Varies but continuous.
- 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: Fully Supporting Cold Water Aquatic Life (IDEQ Status Report 2018/2020)

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

**(i) Physical Characteristics:**

**(a) General Wetland Characteristics:**

Properties: Delineated wetlands within the review included a mixed mosaic of emergent, and scrub-shrub wetland species, dominated by Reed Canary grass, and willow species. Uplands generally were characterized by herbaceous vegetation such as smooth brome, and Canada Thistle  
Wetland size: 0.92 acres

<sup>6</sup>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.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

Wetland type. Explain: PSS/PEM. The wetland complex within the review are consists of emergent and scrub-shrub species. The larger complex extends to the east and maintains similar character, with changes in micro-topography resulting in some tree species, and upland portions.

Wetland quality. Explain: Common, low historical disturbance. Herbaceous layer consists of non-native species.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: Intermittent Explain: The overall wetland complex receives flow upstream of the site during seasonal flooding.

Surface flow is:

Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings: Visual inundation in depressional areas, and a generally high water table (within 12 inches of the surface in September), express a general shallow subsurface flow through the complex.

Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Directly abutting: The wetlands within the review area are part of a larger mosaic complex of wetlands that abut the East Fork Wood River. The relevant reach considered (approximately 50 acres) starts approximately 4500 upstream where roadway fills and a bridge structure bisect the valley bottom at Thunder Road and continue down to the downstream crossing of Hyndman View Drive. The upper portions of the complex are within the mapped floodplain, and the wetland complex appears to be a receiving system from the East Fork Wood River.

Not directly abutting

Discrete wetland hydrologic connection.

Ecological connection. Explain:

Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **30 or more** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **30 or more** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **No Flow/Limited events from wetlands. System receives water from upstream flow patterns..**

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the floodplain. Approximately 70% of the upper portion of the complex is within the mapped 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: N/A

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

Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):

Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: Wetlands include full cover, with around 30% PSS

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: **1**  
 An estimated 40 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)
Y	0.92		
Y	Remaining Portions Not Delineated		

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The overall functions include flood storage attenuation, and general habitat diversity

**C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:  
 TNWs: linear feet; width (ft); or, acres.  
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.
- 2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**  
 Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:  
 Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:  
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):  
 Tributary waters: linear feet; width (ft).  
 Other non-wetland waters: acres.  
Identify type(s) of waters:
- 3. Non-RPWs<sup>8</sup> 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 delineated within the review area are part of a larger continuous complex which abuts the East Fork Wood River. The Complex although not delineated in its entirety, is apparent from the supporting information, to include NWI Maps showing continual connections, Soil Maps being partially hydric, the geomorphic position in relation to the floodplain/Valley Bottom, visible saturation, and inundation from aerial imagery in portions of the complex, and similar character and composition of vegetation from the delineated property east and south to the 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: **0.92** 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.

---

<sup>8</sup>See Footnote # 3.

**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.<sup>9</sup>**

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

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

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

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



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

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

#### **SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES**

##### **A. SUPPORTING DATA**

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Wetland Delineation Map (Figure 5) Dated Oct. 29, 2021
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Revised Wetland Delineation Report, Dated October 29, 2021
  - 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 Stream Stats Application
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: USGS Quad Map 1:24K Hailey, Idaho
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS Online Wetland Mapper Review Date, 11/9/2021
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps: Digitized FIRM Map
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth Aerial Imagery, 7/1992, 8/2009, 7/2017; Aerial Imagery of Idaho (2019 60CM)
  - or  Other (Name & Date):
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: NWW-0-33910 (Adjacent Property, Record not found); NWW-2019-00554 (Downstream Delineation)
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** The review area is located along the northern side of the valley floor, adjacent to the upstream loop of Hyndman View Road. The delineated wetlands with the review area extend beyond the property to the east as part of a larger complex which abuts the East Fork Big Wood River. This was likely a historical overflow floodplain system that physically connected back to the East Fork Wood River downgradient of the property, however development such as roadway fills, and land use changes overtime have eliminated surficial flow from the review area during a normal year. Soils Units for the area include hydric groups that match the geomorphic position of the complex (Adamson-River wash Complex 0-2 Percent Slopes). The USFWS Wetland Maps, show a continual more linear wetland complex originating from the East Fork Wood River, and terminating at the property which matches the type and condition seen today (Palustrine Scrub-shrub Seasonally Flooded (PSSc). Review of ariel imagery identified similar vegetative stratum across the entire complex to the East Fork Wood River and displayed multiple drainage patterns and small portions within the overall complex which regularly exhibit saturation to the surface.