

**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): 03/30/2022**

**B. ST PAUL, MN DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: MVS-2022-103**

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

State: MO

County/parish/borough: St. Charles City: St. Charles

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 38.8188° **Pick List**, Long. -90.5018° **Pick List**.

Universal Transverse Mercator: 15

Name of nearest waterbody: Missouri River

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC):

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: 03/30/2022

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):<sup>1</sup>**

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.  
Explain:

**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:

Other (explain, if not covered above): **0.2 acre abandoned farm pond**

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

