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): JAN 25 2016

B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Albany Public Schools Project, MVP-2015-03656-RMM

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State: MN County/parish/borough: Stearns City: Albany
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 45.63182° N, Long. 94.55957° W
Universal Transverse Mercator: 5054335.24720477, 378459.973416023
Name of nearest waterbody: South Two River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Headwaters South Two River (070102010101)
☐ 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: 3 November 2015
☐ 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: Two waters onsite were determined to be isolated (Wetland 1 and Retention Basin). The first water, referred to and labeled as "Retention basin" on the attached figure, is an isolated stormwater feature constructed in dry land. Review of the Stearns County SSURGO Soil Survey shows non-hydric soils in the area of the stormwater basin. There were no outlets identified or any other surface connection to a water of the U.S. Thus, this feature is isolated and non-jurisdictional. The second water, referred to and labeled as "Wetland 1" on the attached figure, is a Type 5 wetland dominated by reed canary grass. The basin is topographically separated from nearby North Lake. Review of Stearns County LiDAR data indicates that the Wetland 1 basin lacks a surface hydrologic connection to North Lake, a jurisdictional water. Thus, Wetland 1 is an isolated wetland and is non-jurisdictional.

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

¹ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
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.
- [x] 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 irrigate 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:

- [x] Wetlands: 1.5 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:

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):

- [x] Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Location Map
- [x] Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - [x] 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:
- [x] U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
  - [x] USGS NED data.
  - [ ] USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- [ ] U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:
- [x] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Stearns County Soil Survey
- [x] National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS NWI
- [x] State/Local wetland inventory map(s): MN DNR PWI
- [ ] FEMA/FIRM maps:
  - [ ] 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- [x] Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2013 FSA
  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: The waterbodies described above, Wetland 1 and Retention Basin do not support a link to interstate or foreign commerce because they are not known to be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreation or other purposes; they do not produce fish or shellfish that could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; and they are not known to be used for industrial purposes for interstate or foreign commerce. The waterbodies have been determined to be non-jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act because the wetlands lack connections and/or relationships sufficient to serve as a basis for jurisdiction.
Figure 4. Delineated Wetlands for Project Area