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):
   - Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: This JD is for Wetland 3. The wetland 3 (0.08 acre) is located within a depression. The isolated wetland is approximately 1,800 feet from the nearest jurisdictional water of the United States. There is no natural or man-made discrete and/or confined surface water connection between the wetland and any other jurisdictional water, nor is there a shallow subsurface connection to any other jurisdictional water. There are no culverts or tributaries that provide flow to or from the wetland. There is no evidence of surface-water flow to or from the wetland, precluding an ecological connection to jurisdictional waters. Wetland 3 is surrounded by land in agricultural production. The wetland is not located in the mapped 100 year flood plain. Therefore, during times of heavy precipitation there is a very low probability that floodwater would reach an elevation necessary for water to flow from other jurisdictional waters into the wetland. Based on a review of the USGS Quadrangle Sheet, the wetland based on its landscape position does not appear to be part of a recognizable hydrologic system. The wetland does not cross any state boundary and does not have a use which would associate them with interstate commerce. The wetland does not support a link to interstate or foreign commerce because it is not known to be used by interstate 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 in interstate or foreign commerce. In consideration of the January 2, 2001, United States Supreme Court decision, Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, we have determined Wetland 3 to be isolated and non-jurisdictional under Section 404 of the CWA.

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

1 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
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: 0.08 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: Stantec c/o Jeff Kraemer
   □ 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: 1:24k Quad WI - De Forest
   □ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey
   □ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
   □ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): WWI
   □ FEMA/FIRM maps:
       □ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
   □ Photographs: □ Aerial (Name & Date): WDNR SWDV 2017, 2015, 2013, and 2008
       or □ Other (Name & Date): Ground photos provided by consultant, 27 Oct 17
   □ 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: