

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

**SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):** 17 March 2020.

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Seattle District, NWS-2019-709, Cadman Materials (Granite Falls JD).  
Name of water being evaluated on this JD form: Wetland 34

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

State: Washington County: Snohomish City: Granite Falls

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat: 48.114738 N, Long: -121.928154 W

Universal Transverse Mercator: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of nearest waterbody: South Fork Stillaguamish River.

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 17110008.

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. List other JDs: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 5 February 2020.

Field Determination. Date(s): 26 July 2007.

**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):<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

**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** and **Pick List****

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: Wetland 34 is an isolated wetland with no surface or sub-surface connection to other waters of the U.S. .

<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).

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

**SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS**

- A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs: NOT APPLICABLE
- B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS: NOT APPLICABLE
- C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION: NOT APPLICABLE
- D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE: NOT APPLICABLE

**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):<sup>4</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:**

- 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: 0.18 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: "Granite Falls Aggregate Facility - Phase 3 Wetland Delineation" by WSP USA dated December 2019, "Granite Falls Tributary Map" by Cadman Materials dated August 2019, "Associated Sand & Gravel Company, Inc., Granite Falls, Wetland and Stream Assessment" by Shockey/Grent, Inc. dated revised May 11, 1994, "Rinker Materials Wetland Delineation, Granite Falls, Washington (letter REport)" by ESA Adolfson, dated July 26, 2007, "Wetland Characterization, Associated Sand and Gravel, Granite Falls, WASHINGTON" by Cooke Scientific Services, dated October 8, 1996.
- 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: \_\_\_\_\_.

<sup>4</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.

- 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' Granite Falls quadrangle
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Snohomish County.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: \_\_\_\_\_.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): \_\_\_\_\_
- FEMA/FIRM maps: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: \_\_\_\_\_ (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): \_\_\_\_\_  
or  Other (Name & Date): \_\_\_\_\_.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Applicable/supporting case law: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Other information (please specify): Approved JD Form for Wetland 34 dated 26 Sep 2013.

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** In an Approved Jurisdictional Determination (AJD) dated September 26, 2013, the Corps determined that Wetland 34 was an isolated wetland with no surface connection to flowing waters of the U.S. The wetland is enclosed in a small closed drainage basin which has no surface water connection to the South Fork Stillaguamish River to the south or Canyon Creek to the north. The Corps' site visit on July 26, 2007, confirmed that the wetland has no surface or likely shallow subsurface connection to other waters of the U.S. including traditional navigable waters (TNW). Potential sub-surface connections to other waters of the U.S. are highly speculative because the wetlands are over 1,900 feet from the South Fork Stillaguamish River, the nearest stream with seasonal or perennial flow, and because the wetland appears to retain most of its inflow as indicated by its persistent flooded condition. In addition, the wetland's on-going use (or potential use), degradation, or destruction would not affect interstate or foreign commerce including recreation, fish harvest, or industrial activities. Subsequently, that AJD expired in 2018 and a new AJD was requested. We determined that conditions remain the same and confirmed our previous AJD is still valid. This was coordinated with EPA, Region 10 and Corps HQ via email on 19 February 2020. On 11 March 2020, EPA concurred with our determination. No response was received from Corps HQ.