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.

	CTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): DEC 2 1 2018	
B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: I-894/I-41 Noise Barriers, MVP-2016-01397 ANM		
c.	PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: State: WI County/parish/borough: Milwaukee City: Greenfield Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.9832° N, Long88.0387° W. Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16 (X 415313.894772, Y 4759472.529471) Name of nearest waterbody: Root River Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Great Lakes Region (04040002) 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 19, 2018	

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 two review areas contain roadside ditches (W-8, W-10, W-11, W-17, W-18, D-2, and D-3) created in upland and are not waters of the U.S. This was confirmed by reviewing the 2016 Graef I-894 wetland delineation report, Milwaukee County aerials and hydrology maps, Google Earth aerials and ground level photos. The roadside ditches were created in upland when I-894 was constructed, sometime between 1963 and 1967. The ditches do not have a relatively permanent flow of water. The determination of no jurisdiction for the ditches is in accordance with the preamble to the 1986 Corps Regulations (33 CFR Parts 320-330), which states that the Corps does not generally consider the following to be waters of the U.S.; non-tidal drainage and irrigation ditches excavated on dry land. Further clarification is provided in the December 2, 2008 Revised Guidance on Clean Water Act Jurisdiction following the Supreme Court Decision in Rapanos v. U.S. and Carabell v. U.S. issued jointly by the Corps and EPA, which indicates that ditches excavated wholly in and draining only uplands and that do not carry a relatively permanent flow of water are not waters of the United States.

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): $\rm N\!/\!A$

¹ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

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): The roadside ditches (W-8, W-10, W-11, W-17, W-18, D-2, and D-3) are not ters of the U.S. pursuant to the 2008 Rapanos guidance and the preamble to the Corps 1986 regulations (33 CFR ets 320-330).
	Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> 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.
	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.
	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: 2016 Graef IH 894 Wetland
	or ⋈ Other (Name & Date):Ground level photos from Google Earth and 2016 delineation 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: