

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): October 7, 2022

B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: MVP-2022-01272 TKO

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Wisconsin

County/parish/borough: Brown

City: Pittsfield

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 44.5898° N, Long. -88.2125° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: South Branch Suamico River

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 04030103

☒ 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: August 31, 2022

☐ 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 review area includes four wetlands, labeled Wetland 1 (0.10 acres), Wetland 2 (0.04 acres), Wetland 3 (0.09 acres) and Wetland 4 (0.01 acres).**

W-3 is an isolated wetland, based on a review of the June 2022 wetland delineation report by Cedar Corporation, which included NRCS hydric soil data, Wisconsin Wetland Inventory data, National Wetland Inventory data, aerial photos, and ground level site photos, as well as other desktop resources such as hillshade/Digital Elevation Model (DEM) maps. Based on a review of aerial photography and hillshade/DEM maps from the National Regulatory Viewer, Wetland 3 is a shallow depression surrounded by upland and contains no inlets or outlets (culverts) that would connect it to a downstream water. There is no confined channel that directs flow outside of the wetland. The closest tributary is the South Branch of the Suamico River, approximately 0.5 miles to the east of wetland 3.

The wetland does not border, is not neighboring to or contiguous with another water of the US. It is not separated from another water of the US by man-made barriers, dikes or berms. Due to existing and surrounding land use (disturbed upland, residential development, transportation corridors) and proximity to other waters, there are no ecological connections to other wetlands or waters. This aquatic resource does not support a link to interstate or foreign commerce; is not known to be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreation or other purposes; does 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 commerce. Therefore, the Corps has determined that Wetland 3 is not regulated by the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

¹ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

Wetlands 1,2, and 4 are linear drainage ditches that were constructed in upland and drain only upland, evidenced by historic aerial photos and NRCS soil data. Based on photos from the delineation report, they do not carry relatively permanent flow. In accordance with the 2008 Rapanos guidance and the preamble to the 1986 Corps Regulations (33 CFR Parts 320-330), 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 do not carry a relatively permanent flow 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): 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

F. 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): See Section II.B2 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: 0.09 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.

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: June 2022 Cedar Corporation Delineation 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.

-

11



22

11

1

3