

**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 19, 2021

**B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** MVP-2016-02851-MJB

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: Minnesota

County/parish/borough: Hennepin County

City: Crystal

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 45.02800° N, Long. -93.35848° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Bassett Creek

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.

**D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):**

☒ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: October 1, 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):<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 for this jurisdictional determination is the extent of the Gaulke Pond and is identified as a PUBH wetland, within the review area. The wetland is a depressional basin located within a residential area and does not have a historical surface or shallow subsurface hydrologic connection to any navigable waters or their tributaries. The pond acts as a sedimentation basin for the city. Overflow is pumped from the pond upstream, at which point it enters the stormwater system. The historical United States Geographical Society (USGS) 1:24K Quad maps from 1902 until 2019 were reviewed and the area of the wetland basin is shown on these maps as a depressional and isolated wet basin, with no known surface or subsurface connection. The National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) was reviewed and a flow line from a wetland upstream is shown to cease at the depressional area of this pond, with no continued flow from the pond downstream. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey indicates no hydric soils are located in the surrounding areas. The National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps and topography data, and the materials submitted, show the wetlands are isolated with no surface or subsurface water connection to a water of the United States (WOUS). An unnamed tributary, identified by the USGS NHD as intermittent, is located approximately 0.4 miles south of the wetland, with upland between the pond and the tributary. Residential and institutional development is located between the unnamed tributary and the wetland. A review of the surrounding topography indicates the wetland is within an isolated depression with no topographic connection to any other waterbody. The review area is not within a 100-year floodplain. The wetland in review is surrounded by non-jurisdictional upland. We have determined that this wetland is an isolated depression. The surrounding land use is comprised of residential and institutional uses and does not provide cover or habitat between the wetlands and other aquatic resources. This wetland does not have an ecological connection to a WOUS.**

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

The wetland 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; 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 or foreign commerce. The wetland was determined to not be a water of the U.S. and not to be jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act.

### 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):

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: 2.5 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: Gaulke Pond Sediment Removal application
- ☒ 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:
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Hennepin County Soil Survey
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: current USFWS NWI
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps:
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)

- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): FSA NAIP 2019  
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:**