SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 29, 2019

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: MVP-2019-00068-AIS

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Wisconsin  County/parish/borough: Washington County  City: Jackson
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 43.315795 °N, Long. 88.165991 °W
   Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16, x405449.732276, y4796544.352837
   Name of nearest waterbody: Cedar Creek
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Southwestern Lake Michigan (04040003)

☑ Check if map/diagram of review area is 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: March 22, 2019
   ☐ 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): ☑
      Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined not to be jurisdictional.
      Explain: The review area includes one wetland, labeled ‘Wetland Area’ on the enclosed figure MVP-2019-00068-AIS Page 2 of 6. The ‘Wetland Area’, approximately 0.19 acre in size, developed as a result of earthmoving in a previously non-wetland/upland area, as seen on the attached figure labeled MVP-2019-00068-AIS Page 3 of 6, and it is not a jurisdictional water of the U.S. (WOUS) under Section 404 of the CWA. The purpose of the excavation was not to restore or create wetland at this location, it was created incidental to ongoing construction and grading activities on the property. The non-jurisdictional determination for ‘Wetland Area’ was completed pursuant to 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.: “Waterfilled depressions created in dry land incidental to construction activity and pits excavated in dry land for the purpose of obtaining fill, sand, or gravel unless and until the construction or excavation operation is abandoned and the resulting body of water meets the definition of waters of the United States.” Evidence of continued construction on the development to the south can be seen on aerial imagery through 2018.

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:

1 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
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: See Section II.B.2, above.
- Wetlands: ___ (# ac.)

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.
- Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
  - 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: Washington County Soil Survey
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Wisconsin Wetland Inventory
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
  - 100-year Floodplain Elevation is:
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth (2000-2018)
  - or Other (Name & Date): Ground level photos provided by applicant
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. REQUIRED ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD.