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): March 25, 2020
- B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: 2019-01727-JRS (Schlimm RLT Property)
- C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Wisconsin County/parish/borough: Outagamie City: Greenville

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 44.2835° N, Long. -88.5027° E.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Unnamed

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 04030202, Wolf

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: February 26, 2020

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: Wetlands 2 and 5, located in the review areas, are isolated features and are not considered Waters of the US. These wetlands were identified in a wetland delineation completed by McMahon Associates, Inc. Review of aerial photography (Google Earth 1992-2018) indicates the wetlands are depressional features that do not have a surface or subsurface connection to any other water. These wetlands do not border, are not neighboring to or contiguous with another water of the US. They are not separated from another water of the US by man-made barriers, dikes or berms. Topographic maps do not show conditions that would create a direct surface or subsurface connection to downstream waters. Portions of Wetland 2 drain east towards a field edge. No ditch is present in the field edge that would transport surface water down slope. No surface water is ever seen in aerials draining this wetland north/west towards the existing tributary. Aerial photos and topographic maps do no indiciate water escapes Wetland 5. Due to existing and surrounding land use (agricultural) and degraded nature of the wetlands there is no ecological connection to other wetlands or waters. These aquatic resources do not support a link to interstate or foreign commerce; are not known to be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreation or other purposes; do not produce fish or shellfish that could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; and are not known to be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce. Therefore, the Corps has determined Wetland 2 and 5 are not regulated by the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

¹ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

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 DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): N/A 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 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: Wetland 2, 5: 1.46 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. SE included in case file and, where checked

ns shall be i
po
1929)

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: