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.

County/parish/borough: Hennepin City: Minnetrista Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 44.963045° N, Long. -93.692628° W.

SEC A.	CTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):	OCT	25	2017
B.	ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: MVP-2017-03244-RMM			
C.	PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:			

Universal Transverse Mercator: Name of nearest waterbody: Deer Creek

State: MN

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 07010206

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.

REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): Office (Desk) Determination. Date: October 3, 2017

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

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 review area contains 4 wetlands; however, the applicant has only requested an AJD for Wetland 1. Review of the Hennepin County Soil Survey Geographic Database shows Wetland 1 is located in a predominantly non-hydric soil unit. The National Wetland Inventory map does not depict the wetland and does not show the wetland being connected to or adjacent to any larger wetland complex that may be associated with a tributary. There were no outlets identified or any other surface or shallow subsurface connections to a water of the U.S. The wetland is surrounded by upland. There are no other indicators of a surficial hydrologic connection to any water of the U.S. Due to the disturbed nature of this area, the wetland does not have an ecological connection to other waters within or adjacent to the review area. Wetland 1 is isolated and is non-jurisdictional.

The waterbody described above, Wetland 1 does 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; it does not produce fish or shellfish that could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; and it is not known to be used for industrial purposes for interstate or foreign commerce. The waterbody has been determined to be non-jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act because the wetland lacks connections and/or relationships sufficient to serve as a basis for jurisdiction.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

- TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs: N/A
- CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY): N/A
- SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION: N/A

¹ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

- D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): $\ensuremath{\mathrm{N/A}}$
- 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

[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):
f j [[rovide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR actors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional adagment (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 1 0.03 acre acres.
	rovide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such 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.
A. SI	ION IV: DATA SOURCES. IPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked not requested, appropriately reference sources below): Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Location Map
]]]	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: .

MVP-2017-03244-RMM Page 1 of 2





Figure 1 - Site Location



MVP-2017-03244-RMM Page 2 of 2




Figure 2 - Existing Conditios (2016 MnGEO Photo)

