### 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): December 20, 2021
- B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: MVP-2021-01887-DDP (SAP 013-626-008) (Chisago, County of / SAP 013-626-008 / CSAH 26)
- C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State:MN County/parish/borough: Chisago City: Center City

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 45.395119° N, Long. -92.804001° E.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Lawrence Creek

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): (07030005) Upper Mississippi Region

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: December 17, 2021
  - 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

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.

- 1. Waters of the U.S.: N/A
- 2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):1

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: The SAP 013-626-008 / CSAH 26 review area contains one aquatic feature for review Wet Ditch 3 (0.071 ac). The majority of the review area consists of urban and agricultural land use. Based on analysis of multiple years of aerial photography and the September 12th 2021 SEH CSAH 26 Deliniation Report, the Corps has determined that Wet Ditch 3 is not jurisdictional.

Wet Ditch 3 is best described as a linear roadside drainage feature excavated in uplands during the initial construction of CSAH 26. In accordance with the December 2nd 2008 Rapanos guidance, Wet Ditch 3 is not within the Corps jurisdiction because Wet Ditch 3 was constructed in uplands, drains only uplands and does not have relatively permanent flow.

#### SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

- A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs: N/A
- B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY): N/A
- C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION: N/A
- D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):  $\rm\,N/A$
- 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): N/A

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

Γ.		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): See Section II.B.2.
	fact	vide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR ors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional gment (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.
		vide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such adding 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.
	SUPI	<u>ON IV: DATA SOURCES.</u> PORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked requested, appropriately reference sources below):
$\boxtimes$		Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: September 12th 2021 SEH CSAH 26
	linia	ation Report
		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: 1:24K Quad Name: Lindstrom USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Chisago County Soil Survey
	$\boxtimes$	National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: CorpMaps layer viewed December 17, 2021
		State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
	Н	FEMA/FIRM maps: 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
$\boxtimes$		Photographs:   Aerial (Name & Date): Aerial and other provided by the applicant and Google Earth 1991,
200	03, 2	2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2015, 2017 and 2021.
		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):

# B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: