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

REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 5/22/12

DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: NWO-2012-570-PIE Wetland D, NWO-2012-570-PIE Wetland E, NWO-

2012-570-PIE V	Wetland F
intersection of State:South Center coo Name of no Name of no Name of w Check	T LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:2 miles North of Harrisburg, SD, at the SE corner of the SD HWY 115 & 106 h Dakota County/parish/borough:Lincoln City:Harrisburg ordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 43.460063N; Long96.723023W
□ Office	PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): e (Desk) Determination. Date:5/3/12 Determination. Date(s):
review area. [Re	rs subject to the ebb and flow of the tide. rs are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.
B. CWA SECT	TION 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]
	dicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): TNWs, including territorial seas Wetlands adjacent to TNWs Relatively permanent waters ² (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
No	entify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area: on-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres. etlands: acres.
	ts (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List ation of established OHWM (if known):
⊠ F	regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): ³ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain:Several isolated wetland areas exist on this project site, Wetlands D and E are linear (i.e. field drainage/waterway) and Wetland F is depressional (i.e, prairie pothole). These areas were identified by the proponent's consultant on a wetland

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

² 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).

³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

delineation report dated 3/30/2012. This report identified 6 wetland areas; 3 of which areas showed no fluvial connection to an unnamed trib to the Big Sioux River, and are therefore isolated due to the apparent lack of hydrologic or topographic connection to waters of the United States and identified in this JD (a JD for the 3 jurisdictional wetlands can be found on Approved JD NWO-2012-570-PIE Wetlands A,B,C dated 5/3/12). Furthermore these wetlands lack a direct or indirect, non-speculative, linkage to adjacent waters based on historic aerial imagery in both wet and dry cycles. One could speculate that these wetlands flow north and then along Co. HWY 106 but there is no evidence to conclusively claim that water flows through/under several upland breaks in the roadside ditch .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

F.	_	URISDICTIONAL 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 Engi Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements.				
	⊠ R€	eview area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.			
	\boxtimes	Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the			
	\square w	"Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR). Vaters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain:			
	_	ther: (explain, if not covered above):			
	factors	e acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional ent (check all that apply):			
		on-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).			
		akes/ponds: acres. ther non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .			
		Vetlands: 0.03 acres.			
	Provide	e acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such			
		ng is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):			
		on-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet, width (ft).			
		akes/ponds: acres. ther non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .			
		ther non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: . Vetlands: 0.2acres.			
SF.	CTION	IV: DATA SOURCES.			
<u> </u>	2011011				
Α.		RTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked			
		quested, appropriately reference sources below): [aps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant:Submitted by applicant's consultant.			
		ata sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.			
		Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. Delineation boundaries appear to be accurate			
		Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report. his office does not concur with the preliminary quantitative			
		nents provided by the consultant. Some wetlands had been recently disturbed, additionally the delineation was conducted ely early in the growing season (March).			
		ata sheets prepared by the Corps: .			
		orps navigable waters' study:			
		.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:			
		USGS NHD data.			
		USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. 10170203, Lower Big Soiux. Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota			
		.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:1:24 K, SD-HARRISBURG.			
		SDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: ational wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Missouri-Big Sioux.			
		ational wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name.wissouri-big sloux. ate/Local wetland inventory map(s): .			
		EMA/FIRM maps: .			
	10	00-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)			
	⊠ Pł	notographs: Aerial (Name & Date):Google Earth 7/14/2010, 4/22/1996.			
	_ n.	or Other (Name & Date): . File no, and date of response letters			
		revious determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: pplicable/supporting case law:			
		pplicable/supporting scientific literature: .			
		ther information (please specify):			

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Three affected wetlands are isolated and show no hydrologic or topographic connection to waters of the United States. Furthermore the wetlands lack a direct or indirect, non-speculative, linkage to adjacent waters based on historic aerial imagery in both wet and dry cycles. It is also determined that the wetlands have no documented use by interstate or foreign travelers relating to waterborne commerce activities, does not support fish of shellfish that could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce, and is not used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.

See attached maps of the review area.