SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
A.  REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): February 6, 2013

B.  DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:  Chicago District, John DiMucci, LRC-2010-764

C.  PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SE Intersection of Route 12 and Old McHenry Road
State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: Lake  City: Lake Zurich
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42023344°N, Long. -87.10765° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Buffalo 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: 07 Feb 2013
☒ Field Determination.  Date(s): 18 November 2010

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 “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 (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☒ Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

   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: 1.05 acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

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

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

---

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).
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. Wetlands are connected to creek to the west via a pipe under Route 12; and creek has RPW flow as it is mapped as a blue-line stream on the USGS maps.
   - 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:

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: Farmed wetland 3 is a farmed portion of wetland 3 which is connected to the creek to the west via a pipe under Route 12; and the creek is mapped as a blue-line stream on the USGS maps.

   - 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: 1.05 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: Hey & Associates, Inc.
- ☒ 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: Lake Zurich HA 208, 1966,
- ☒ USGS NHD data.
- ☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
- ☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Lake County ADID, Pick List.
- ☒ FEMA/FIRM maps:
- ☒ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): 2007.
- ☒ Other (Name & Date):
- ☒ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: Lake Co. PJD Letter dated February 21, 2011.
- ☒ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- ☒ Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The subject wetland area (farmed and un-farmed) drain to the west via a pipe into Buffalo Creek, an RPW, which flows directly into the Fox River (TNW).
SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 12 DEC 13

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:  Chicago District, Terra Cotta, LRC-2012-688

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: McHenry  City: Prairie Grove
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. °N, Long. ° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Sleepy Hollow Creek
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Fox River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Kishwaukee (07090006)
   ☑ 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 DEC 13
   ☑ Field Determination.  Date(s): 24 JUN 13, 12 JUL 13

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.

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There Are “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 (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☑ Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
   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: 9.91 acres.
   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

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

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

---

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).
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: .
   - 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: .


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: Exhibit 7 dated April 24, 2013 contained within the April 25, 2013 permit application identifies the approved wetland boundary for Wetland 1. Please note that Farmed Wetland 1 was completely filled under the June 7, 2013 authorization.
   - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
   - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
   - Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
   - USGS NHD data.
   - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
   - USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.
   - National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List, Pick List.
   - 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 scientific literature: .
   - Other information (please specify): Site visits notes documenting final decision. Although there was some wetness outside of the delineated wetland areas even after period of no rain, the wetland fairly well drained and the wetland as delineated is the best assessment of where the current boundary lies. It may wiggle one way or the other in spots, but overall, it seems accurate:
     24 JUN 13: Visited site. Identified that there was standing water in a lower area that coincided with the wetness on some aerials. There was some rain the night before, not sure how much. Vegetation outside of RCG was all Kentucky bluegrass. Consider requesting data point here.
     12 JUL 13: Revisited the site after no rain for a few days. This area was not dry. I determined to go along with the boundaries because it would be difficult to make any significant changes to the boundary without having undisturbed vegetation. The sod farm made this
difficult. Overall, the wetland adjacent to the creek has been drained due to downcutting of the creek, so even some within the delineated portion of Wetland 1 have some dry species present.

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:**