

**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): 11 January 2012**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Omaha District; Merjent / Enbridge; NWO-2011-2543-BIS.**

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

State: North Dakota. County/parish/borough: Ward County. City: Berthold.  
 Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format):

Wetland No.:	Latitude(dd nad83)	Longitude dd nad83)	Wetland Size (Within project review area):
1	48.315054	-101.744741	0.41
2	48.314106	-101.745006	0.78
3	48.313124	-101.747305	1.62
4	48.314909	-101.746731	0.85
5	48.314132	-101.747667	0.23
6	48.314567	-101.748334	0.04
7	48.316011	-101.747910	0.03
8	48.315684	-101.749387	0.16
9	48.314880	-101.749239	0.13
10	48.314397	-101.749491	0.49
11	48.313771	-101.750605	0.11
12	48.313830	-101.751288	0.09
13	48.314005	-101.752403	1.41
14	48.313140	-101.752506	0.59
15	48.313842	-101.753503	0.15
16	48.315439	-101.750777	0.22
17	48.315087	-101.752217	0.36
18	48.314598	-101.750947	0.06
19	48.314585	-101.750106	0.31
20	48.316371	-101.751051	0.33
21	48.314694	-101.753439	0.38
22	48.314369	-101.754595	0.29
23	48.314204	-101.754220	0.04
24	48.315227	-101.755300	0.14
25	48.315271	-101.754349	0.10
26	48.314462	-101.755834	.091
27	48.313429	-101.755602	0.17
28	48.312982	-101.754914	0.29
29	48.316126	-101.753694	3.88
30	48.317176	-101.753592	0.13
31	48.317156	-101.754353	0.15
32	48.318052	-101.754986	0.26
33	48.316215	-101.757385	2.39
34	48.315462	-101.757245	0.11



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

- Office (Desk) Determination. Date: **December 9, 2011.**
- 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. [Required]

- Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
  - Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.
- Explain: .

**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. [Required]

**1. Waters of the U.S.**

**a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):<sup>1</sup>**

- TNWs, including territorial seas
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- Relatively permanent waters<sup>2</sup> (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
- Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

**b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:**

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.  
Wetlands:

**c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

**2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):<sup>3</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: **These are 58 isolated wetlands identified within the project area. Wetlands identified are not jurisdictional. Not used for recreation or industrial purposes. There is no nexus to interstate commerce. The wetlands lack a discernable surface connection to WoUS. The wetlands also lack sufficient evidence of hydrologic and ecological interaction with a WoUS.**

**SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS**

**A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs**

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over TNWs and wetlands adjacent to TNWs. If the aquatic resource is a TNW, complete Section III.A.1 and Section III.D.1. only; if the aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

**1. TNW**

Identify TNW: .

Summarize rationale supporting determination: .

**2. Wetland adjacent to TNW**

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”:

**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.

<sup>1</sup> Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least “seasonally” (e.g., typically 3 months).

<sup>3</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

- 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:
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
- Wetlands: **58 wetlands with a total estimated 35.43-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:
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
- Wetlands: **58 wetlands.**

#### **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: .
- 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: **Tagus SE and Berthold - 1:24,000.**
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: .
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: **Tagus SE and Berthold - 1:24,000.**
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date):.
  - 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): **Google Earth Pro.**

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** See attached aerial maps/photos.