#### 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): March 16, 2023
- B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Sibley Service Line, MVP-2022-02172-RMH
- C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: This AJD considers wetlands identified as Wetlands 2 and 11 within the approximately 7.5 mile long project site.

State: Minnesota County/parish/borough: Nobles County City: Rushmore and Ransom twps Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 43.547859° N. Long. -95.774008° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: X:275909.857778, Y: 4825395.446952, Zone 15

Name of nearest waterbody: Little Rock River

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Missouri Region (HUC 10170204)

- 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: February 22, 2023
  - ☐ 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):<sup>1</sup>
  - Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: The review area contains several wetlands but this AJD is limited to the boundaries of Wetland 2 and 11. The wetlands are depressional areas located within road ROW in a predominately agricultural area. A review of aerial imagery did not indicate an unbroken surface or shallow sub-surface connection to jurisdictional waters. In addition, the wetlands are not mapped within the 100-year floodplain. Based upon a review of aerial photographs, United States Geological Survey (USGS) 1:24K Quad and its associated National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey, National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, topography data, and the materials submitted, the wetlands are determined to be hydrologically isolated with no surface water connection to a water of the United States (WOUS). The wetlands in review are surrounded by upland, and have no swales, ditches, pipes, or other means that would provide a surface or subsurface connection to a WOUS. We have determined that these wetlands are isolated depressions and hydrologically separated from other aquatic resources. The surrounding land use comprised of a gricultural and transportation uses does not provide cover or habitat between the wetlands and other aquatic resources. These wetlands do not have an ecological connection to a WOUS.

The wetlands do not support a link to interstate or foreign commerce because it is not known to be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreation or other purposes; do not produce fish or shellfish that could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; and is not known to be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate or foreign commerce. The wetlands were determined to not be a WOUS and not to be jurisdictional under the CWA.

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

## **SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS**

Maxar

- 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

	SUC	CH WAIERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): N/A
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):
	fact judg	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: Wetland 2: 0.07 ac. and Wetland 11: 0.02 ac. acres.
	a fii	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.
	and  do	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):  Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Joint application form and supporting cumentation submitted by Banner Associates, Inc., dated November 10, 2022.  Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
		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: USGS 1:24K Quad Name: Sibley West USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Nobles County Soil Survey 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)
$\boxtimes$		Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Esri Community Maps Contributors, OpenStreetMap, Microsoft,
		IERE, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, EPA, NPS, US Census
Bu	reau	a, USDA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, SafeGraph, FAO, METI/NASA, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, USGS,

or ☑ Other (Name & Date):site photos submitted with report

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: