LRC-2015-540 – Form 1 of 2

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): 12/29/2015

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Lake County Department of Transportation – JD, LRC-2015-540 – Form 1 of 2

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Right of way of intersection of Wilson Road and Nippersink Road in the Village of Round Lake and Unincorporated Lake County, as depicted on the attached map

State: **Illinois** County/parish/borough: **Lake** City: **Round Lake**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): **Lat. 42.35044°N, Long. -88.13991° W**
Universal Transverse Mercator: **Zone 16; Y: 4689316.01420976; X: 406114.533612657**
Name of nearest waterbody: **Squaw Creek**
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Fox River**
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Upper Fox (07120006)**

☒ 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: **12/7/2015**
☒ Field Determination. Date(s): **9/16/2015**

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: Defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **are and are not** "*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):** [1]
   - ☐ 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 **(Sites 2, 4, 7, 14)**
   - ☐ 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: acres.

   c. **Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction** based on: **Pick List**
   Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

2. **Non-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: **Site 10 is the forested portion of a larger wetland that extends off site to the north but has no outlet to a**

[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.

downstream water. To the south, Site 10 connects to Site 3 via a culvert located under W. Nippersink Road. Site 3 is outside of the review area but is discussed here to support the findings that Site 10 is isolated. Site 3 is mapped as a detention basin on the Lake County ADID map and was found to be a closed depressional area dominated by cattail with only a connection to Site 10 and no other outlet. To the north, Site 10 extends approximately 80 feet to the north with no outlet to a downstream water. There is a ponded area 20 feet to the north, separated from Site 10 by a berm but this ponded area does not outlet to any downstream water either, as it is limited to the backyard of a house and is surrounded by a road to the north, a pool to the east and higher grounds to the west. The closest tributary to Site 3 is Squaw Creek, approximately 2,000 feet to the east.

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: **Pick List**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: As defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW
Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent": .

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

This section summarizes information regarding characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under *Rapanos* have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are "relatively permanent waters" (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant nexus evaluation. Corps districts and EPA regions will include in the record any available information that documents the existence of a significant nexus between a relatively permanent tributary that is not perennial (and its adjacent wetlands if any) and a traditional navigable water, even though a significant nexus finding is not required as a matter of law.

If the waterbody[4] is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) General Area Conditions:
Watershed size: **Pick List**
Drainage area: **Pick List**
Average annual rainfall: inches
Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:
(a) Relationship with TNW:
☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.

[4] Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

☐ Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

Identify flow route to TNW[5]: .
Tributary stream order, if known: .

(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):

Tributary is: ☐ Natural
☐ Artificial (man-made). Explain: .
☐ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: .

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List.**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

☐ Silts ☐ Sands ☐ Concrete
☐ Cobbles ☐ Gravel ☐ Muck
☐ Bedrock ☐ Vegetation. Type/% cover:
☐ Other. Explain: .

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: .
Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: .
Tributary geometry: **Pick List**
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**
Describe flow regime: .
Other information on duration and volume: .

Surface flow is: **Pick List.** Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .
☐ Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):
☐ Bed and banks
☐ OHWM[6] (check all indicators that apply):

☐ clear, natural line impressed on the bank ☐ the presence of litter and debris
☐ changes in the character of soil ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☐ shelving ☐ the presence of wrack line
☐ vegetation matted down, bent, or absent ☐ sediment sorting
☐ leaf litter disturbed or washed away ☐ scour
☐ sediment deposition ☐ multiple observed or predicted flow events
☐ water staining ☐ abrupt change in plant community
☐ other (list):

☐ Discontinuous OHWM.[7] Explain: .

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

☐ High Tide Line indicated by: ☐ Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
☐ oil or scum line along shore objects ☐ survey to available datum;
☐ fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) ☐ physical markings;

[5] Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.
[6] A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.
[7] Ibid.

☐ physical markings/characteristics ☐ vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
☐ tidal gauges
☐ other (list):

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Explain: .
Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
☐ Habitat for:
☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

2. Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) Physical Characteristics:
(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties:
Wetland size: acres
Wetland type. Explain: .
Wetland quality. Explain: .
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain: .

Surface flow is**: Pick List**
Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .
☐ Dye (or other) test performed: .

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
☐ Directly abutting
☐ Not directly abutting
☐ Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: .
☐ Ecological connection. Explain: .
☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: **Pick List.**
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: .
Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):
☐ Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): .
☐ Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: .
☐ Habitat for:
☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **Pick List**
Approximately ( ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

Name/ID	Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)	Name/ID	Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW. Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the *Rapanos* Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below:

1. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D: .

2. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D: .

3. **Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D: .

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:
   ☐ TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
   ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   ☒ Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: **The tributary which Sites 2, 4, 7 and 14 abut is located off site, approximately 1,600 feet from the review area. This tributary is named Squaw Creek and is depicted on the USGS quadrangle as a blue line stream. Squaw Creek flows into Long Lake and then continues north into Fox Lake, which is a TNW.**

☐ Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow "seasonally" (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally: .

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
☐ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
Identify type(s) of waters: .

3. Non-RPWs[8] that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
☐ Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):
☐ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
Identify type(s) of waters: **.**

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
☒ Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
☒ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: **Sites 2, 4, 7 and 14 are really one large wetland complex that has been dissected by Wilson Road and W. Nippersink Road. Site 2 continues under Wilson Road via a culvert and joins Site 7 which continues off site to the east and touches the RPW named Squaw Creek. Likewise, Site 14 is an extension to Site 4 (via the south, off site) and Site 4 joins Site 7 via a culvert under W. Nippersink Avenue.**

☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
☐ Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisidictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
☐ Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.[9]
As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.
☐ Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or
☐ Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
☐ Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

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):[10]
☐ which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
☐ from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
☐ which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.

---

[8] See Footnote # 3.
[9] To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
[10] Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA *Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.*

☐ Interstate isolated waters. Explain: .
☐ Other factors. Explain: .

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
☐ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
Identify type(s) of waters: **.**
☐ Wetlands: acres.

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): **.**

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**: Site 10, 0.003 acres within the review area.**

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.

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: **Huff & Huff.**
☒ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
☒ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. **Delineation report dated December 2014 and included in the record.**
☐ 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: **Wauconda HA 297, 1966**, .
☐ USGS NHD data.
☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: **Wauconda 7.5", 1993**,
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: **NRCS Web Soil Survey**.
☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: **Wauconda**
☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): **Lake County ADID**
☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): **Aerial views obtained on Google Earth Pro and dated from 3/1994 to 6/2015.**
or ☒ Other (Name & Date): **Site photos included in the delineation report and additional photos taken by the agent in a subsequent site visit in November 2015.**
☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
☐ Applicable/supporting case law: People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979)
☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
☐ Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: .

LRC-2015-540 – Form 2 of 2

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): 12/29/2015

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Lake County Department of Transportation – JD, LRC-2015-540 – Form 2 of 2

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Right of way of intersection of Wilson Road and Nippersink Road in the Village of Round Lake and Unincorporated Lake County, as depicted on the attached map
State: **Illinois** County/parish/borough: **Lake** City: **Round Lake**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): **Lat. 42.35044°N, Long. -88.13991° W**
Universal Transverse Mercator: **Zone 16; Y: 4689316.01420976; X: 406114.533612657**
Name of nearest waterbody: **Squaw Creek**
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **None**
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Upper Fox (07120006)**
☒ **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: 12/7/2015**
☒ **Field Determination. Date(s): 9/16/2015**

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*]

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*]

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: .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

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.
☐ Other: (explain, if not covered above): **.**

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):
and requested, appropriately reference sources below):
☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: **Huff & Huff.**
☒ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.

[1] Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

☒ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. **Delineation report dated December 2014 and included in the record.**
☐ 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: **Wauconda HA 297, 1966**, .
☐ USGS NHD data.
☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: **Wauconda 7.5", 1993**,
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: **NRCS Web Soil Survey**.
☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: **Wauconda**
☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): **Lake County ADID**
☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): **Aerial views obtained on Google Earth Pro and dated from 3/1994 to 6/2015.**
or ☒ Other (Name & Date): **Site photos included in the delineation report and additional photos taken by the agent in a subsequent site visit in November 2015.**
☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
☐ Applicable/supporting case law: People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979)
☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
☐ Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: .

☒ Areas are ditches (check all that apply): **Roadside Ditches 1, 2 and 11.**
☐ Non-tidal drainage and irrigation ditches excavated on dry land (51 FR 41217, Nov. 13, 1986). .
☒ Ditches (including roadside ditches) excavated wholly in and draining only uplands and that do not carry a relatively permanent flow of water (USACE JD Form Instructional Guidebook 5/30/2007). **Roadside Ditches 1, 2 and 11.**
☐ Ditches that do not have a relatively permanent flow into waters of the U.S. or between two (or more) waters of the U.S. (USACE JD Form Instructional Guidebook 5/30/2007). .

☐ Area(s) are artificial waters created in upland or dry land: .
☐ Artificially irrigated areas which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased (51 FR 41217, Nov. 13, 1986). .
☐ Artificial lakes or ponds created by excavating and/or diking dry land to collect and retain water and which are used exclusively for such purposes as stock watering, irrigation, settling basins, or rice growing (51 FR 41217, Nov. 13, 1986). .
☐ Artificial reflecting or swimming pools or other small ornamental bodies of water created by excavating and/or diking dry land to retain water for primarily aesthetic reasons (51 FR 41217, Nov. 13, 1986). .
☐ 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 (51 FR 41217, Nov. 13, 1986). .
☐ Waste treatment systems, including treatment ponds or lagoons designed to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act (other than cooling ponds as defined in 40 CFR 423.11(m) which also meet criteria of this definition) (33 CFR 328.3 (a)). .

☐ Area(s) are swales (USACE JD Form Instructional Guidebook 5/30/2007). .
☐ Area(s) are erosional features (including gullies) (USACE JD Form Instructional Guidebook 5/30/2007). .
☐ Area(s) are prior converted cropland (33 CFR 328.3(a)(8)). .
☐ Area(s) are uplands. .
☐ Other: .





0 500 1,000
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N W E S

Legend

- Project Limits
- Wetland

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 7.0
Wetlands and WOUS Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

T:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_WLM.mxd



0 75 150
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N W E S

Legend

- Project Limits
- Data Point
- Wetland

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 7.1
Wetlands and WOUS Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

K:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_WLM.mxd



0 75 150
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N W E S

Legend

- Project Limits
- Data Point
- Wetland

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 7.2
Wetlands and WOUS Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

T:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_WLM.mxd





0 75 150
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N W E S

Legend

- Project Limits
- Data Point
- Wetland

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 7.3
Wetlands and WOUS Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

T:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_WLM.mxd



0 75 150
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N W E S

Legend

- Project Limits
- Data Point
- Wetland

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 7.4
Wetlands and WOUS Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

T:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_WLM.mxd



0 75 150
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N E S W

Legend

- Project Limits
- Data Point
- Stormwater Feature

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 8.1
Stormwater Features Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

T:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_SWLM.mxd



0 75 150
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N W E S

Legend

- Project Limits
- Data Point
- Stormwater Feature

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 8.2
Stormwater Features Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

T:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_SWLM.mxd



0 75 150
Feet

Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County

N W E S

Legend

- Project Limits
- Data Point
- Stormwater Feature

Huff & Huff, Inc.

Figure 8.3
Stormwater Features Location Map
Wilson Road at Nippersink Road
Village of Round Lake and
Unincorporated, Lake County, Illinois

T:\dwgs\TRANSYSTEMS\Wilson_at_Nippersink\TS_Wilson_at_Nippersink_SWLM.mxd