

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 3, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Eakin Creek Property, LRC-2007-808

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NW of I-90 and Route 47

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Huntley
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.13399°N, Long. -88.44221° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Eakin 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: April 12, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): February 19, 2016 & March 18, 2016

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 waters² (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: 5000 linear feet: 5 width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 32.53 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**.

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": .

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: Eakin Creek flows year-round, and 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: **5000** linear feet **5** 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: **Wetland 1A extends from both sides of Eakin Creek throughout its reach. Wetland 1B is an excavated pond with multiple inlets and wetland fringe that is an in-stream pond of Eakin Creek. Wetland 1C has a tile inlet that pipes water from the south to the north directly into Eakin Creek, and has continuous flow. Wetland 5 has a piped outlet to storm drains that go directly into Eakin Creek, and historically was connected to wetland 1A directly. Wetland 7 is a swale area that flows west and is directly connected to a direct tributary arm of Eakin Creek.**
 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: **32.53** 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: V3 Consultants Wetland Delineation Report dated August 4, 2015.
 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: Huntley HA 361, 1971.
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Huntley 7.5", 1992, Pick List, Pick List.
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Huntley,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Kane County ADID, 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: LRC-2007-808 JD Letter dated January 2009..
 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: Site visit with V3 on March 18, 2016 to walk all wetland boundaries to confirm both jurisdiction and concur with wetland delineation.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 17-May-2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, ditch along Railroad Street in Braidwood, IL

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The roadside ditch is part of Claypool ditch tributary, the portion of the ditch under review runs along Railroad St between West Cermak Rd and Bergera Rd in the Villlage of Braidwood, IL

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Will** City: Braidwood
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.273754°N, Long. -88.221210° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Claypool Ditch

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Kankakee River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Kankakee (07120001)**

- 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: 17-May-2016
 Field Determination. Date(s): 3-May-2016

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 waters² (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: 650 linear feet: 15 width (ft) and/or _____ acres.
Wetlands: 0.0 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): N/A.

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: **Kankakee River.**

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

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).

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent":

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: This tributary to Claypool Ditch was observed to have flow when there had no been rain for over a week, additionally, the ditch is also fed stormwater from the urbanized areas adjacent to it, allowing for 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:

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:
 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: **0.0** 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:
 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: Pick List,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List,
 FEMA/FIRM maps:
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google April 2016.
or Other (Name & Date):
 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): Site visit 3-May-2016.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): April 28, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Village of Olympia Fields, LRC-2016-147

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Vollermer Road at Western Avenue

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Olympia Fields
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.52816°N, Long. -87.67562° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Butterfield Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Des Plaines River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Des Plaines (07120004)**

- 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: April 7, 2016
 Field Determination. Date(s): March 25, 2016

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 waters² (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: 200 linear feet: 1 width (ft) and/or _____ acres.
Wetlands: 1 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.**

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": _____

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: Butterfield Creek is a blue-line stream on the USGS Maps. The tributary to Butterfield Creek that runs north through the golf course and directly into Butterfield Creek has year-round flow as confirmed with the golf course grounds keeper, and based on site observations and review of aerials.
 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: **200** linear feet **1** 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: **Wetland 3 has a designated drainpipe inlet that goes directly into Butterfield Creek that replaces an historic overland tributary connection that had relatively permanent flow.**
 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** 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: Cardno JFNew Wetland Delineation Report dated January 19, 2016.
 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:Harvey HA 90, 1964,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Harvey 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage and Part of Cook (1979).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Harvey,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): 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 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: Butterfield Creek is a wide flowing blue-line stream. The tributary to Butterfield Creek on the east end of the project area flows year-round based on testimony of local expert. Wetland 3 has a large outlet pipe under Vollmer Road that replaces (via pipe) the historic overland connection to Butterfield Creek.

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): May 16, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Al Petkus, LRC-2016-189

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Smith Road, North of Rt. 64

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **DuPage** City: St. Charles
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.927°N, Long. -88.26009° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Norton 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: April 25, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): April 21, 2016

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 waters² (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: 3.55 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual

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: .

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.

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 waterbody⁴ 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: 1008237 acres

Drainage area: 393887 acres

Average annual rainfall: 37.97 inches

Average annual snowfall: 33.5 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through 1 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 2-5 river miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.

Project waters are 2-5 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Water flows from off-site wetland complex via Wetland 1 channel, and into storm drain to Norton Creek (less than 1 mile away), which flows west directly into the Fox River (TNW).

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

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.

Tributary stream order, if known: 2.

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

Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: .
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: Farmed during dry spells.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: 1 feet
Average depth: 0.25 feet
Average side slopes: **4:1 (or greater)**.

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: Eroded channel through farm field.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: Absent.

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1 %

(c) **Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **Intermittent but not seasonal flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20 (or greater)**

Describe flow regime: Tributary (Wetland 1) flows after each rain event, and for several days afterwards according to local resident who lives where channel connects to storm drains in back yards of home.

Other information on duration and volume: .

Surface flow is: **Confined**. Characteristics: Flow follows shallow erosional cut in farm field.

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings: .

Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (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;
 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: Water is clear, coming from large detention basin that dumps into large off-site wetland complex which Wetland 1 drains to storm sewers.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(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: 0.43 + 2.26 & 0.76 acres

Wetland type. Explain: Farmed + Emergent, & Forested.

Wetland quality. Explain: Low.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Intermittent flow**. Explain: Water ponds in corner of field for form Farmed Wetland 1 during and after rain events, which is bisected by the non-RPW channel (Wetland 1), which is fed by a large off-site wetland complex. Wetland 2, a forested area, ponds after rain events, and slowly drains to the north via a cut and into the same storm sewer system that carries flow to Norton Creek.

Surface flow is: **Overland sheetflow**

Characteristics: Wide shallow area in corner of farm field for Farmed Wetland 1. Wetland 2 is also sheet flow into a storm sewer inlet/channel.

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. 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 **2-5** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **2-5** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Wetland to navigable waters**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **50 - 100-year** 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: Water through Farmed Wetland 1 has farm fertilizers and pesticides, as well as sediment.

Wetland 2 has clear water, also farm fertilizers and pesticides.

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: **3**

Approximately (3.55) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
Wetland 1	Y	0.10	Farmed Wetland 1	Y	0.43
Wetland 2	Y	0.76	Off-Site Wetland	Y	2.26

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: Farmed wetland 1 is adjacent and contiguous to the tributary to Norton Creek (Wetland 1), has intermittent flow, and exhibits a surface water connection to a traditional navigable waterway. Wetland 2 drains out via a storm drain directly into Norton Creek on an intermittent basis as well. This surface water connection demonstrates the ability of the tributaries to carry pollutants, flood waters, nutrients and organic carbon to the TNW. The adjacent wetlands have the ability to reduce the amount of pollutants and floodwaters reaching the TNW. The headwater wetland 2, and Farmed Wetland 1, are receiving a percentage of their water from groundwater and from runoff from the surrounding uplands before it flows into the Fox River. Wetland 1 is draining a large off-site wetland complex that is fed by a detention basin and road run-off. Wetlands such as these provide stormwater storage, habitat, sediment/toxicant retention and nutrient removal/transformation. The decrease of sedimentation, pollutants, flooding, nutrients and habitat provided by the subject wetland provides a positive effect to the downstream relatively permanent waters and traditional navigable waters. .

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: The wetlands alone, and in combination with other area wetlands, significantly affect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Fox River. Stormwater storage provided by the subject wetlands affect the frequency and extent of downstream flooding, decreasing flood peaks in the Fox River, and in turn impacting navigation and downstream bank erosion and sedimentation. The sediment and pollutant/toxicant retention provided by the subject wetlands has a direct positive effect on the Fox River in regards to navigation and aquatic food webs that are not adapted to thrive in sediment-choked environments. These factors contribute to the finding of a significant nexus between the on-site wetland and the TNW.
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: .
- 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-RPWs⁸ 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: **0.10** acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: **Wetland channel.**

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: .
 - 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 jurisdictional. 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: **3.45** 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).

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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*.

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: 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: 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: Gary R. Weber Associates, Inc Preliminary Wetland Determination dated February 26, 2016.
- 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: Geneva HA 142, 1965, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Geneva 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage County, Illinois (1999).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Geneva, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, 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 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: Site visit on April 21, 2016 where source of water and flow route were walked in the field; as well as interviewing local expert on duration of flows observed over last 5+ years. All the subject wetlands have strong intermittent flow to Norton Creek, which flows directly west into the Fox River a few miles from the site.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 4, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Location Finders International, LRC-2016-203

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SW of I-57 and Manhattan-Monee Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: Will City: Monee

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.4253°N, Long. -87.7714° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Forked Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Kankakee River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Kankakee (07120001)**

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: April 13, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): April 8, 2016

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 waters² (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: 0.25 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**.

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": .

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: Main tile daylight just south of Manhattan-Monee Road, and had defined channel to Forked Creek approximately 500' north. Given multiple water feeds through numerous lateral tiles, and nature of channel north of road, this channel appears to have flow year-round.
 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: **Wetland forms around where tile daylight and extends to both sides.**
 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: **0.25** 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: CBBEL Wetland Assessment Report dated March 10, 2016.
 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: Frankfort HA 231, 1967,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Frankfort 7.5", 1990, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Will County, Illinois (2004).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Frankfort,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): 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 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: Channel walked during site visit on April 8, 2016, with flow going all the way to Forked Creek via a defined channel that is hydrated by the main tile daylighting on the subject property.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 4, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Burr Ridge Town Center, LRC-2016-212

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SE of I-55 and County Line Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Burr Ridge

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.75712°N, Long. -87.90735° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Flag Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Des Plaines River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Pick List**

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: April 13, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): April 8, 2016

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 waters² (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 3.68 acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Established by OHWM.**

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.**

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": .

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: Creek excavated out to create large pond with outlet structure leading into naturalized creek. Creek has year-round flow based on review of all available areas, and size up headwater ponds.
 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: **3.68** 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:
 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.

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: V3 Companies Wetland Delineation and Assessment Report dated July 14, 2015, Revised July 27, 2015, and Updated October 28, 2015.
 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:Hinsdale HA 86, 1964,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Hinsdale 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage and Part of Cook (1979).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Hinsdale,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): 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 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: Area 3 is an ornamental pond / detention area excavated out of Flag Creek, and holds water all year with continuous outflow via a water control structure on the east side.

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): May 13, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Loretto Convent Site, LRC-2016-247

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NW of Rt. 56 and Naperville Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **DuPage** City: Wheaton
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.8389°N, Long. -88.1154° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Spring Brook Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Des Plaines River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Des Plaines (07120004)**

- 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: April 22, 2016
 Field Determination. Date(s): April 21, 2016

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 waters² (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 2.25 acres.
Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual

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: .

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.

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 waterbody⁴ 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: 934048 acres
Drainage area: 836673 acres
Average annual rainfall: 37.97 inches
Average annual snowfall: 33.5 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through 3 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 20-25 river miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.
Project waters are 15-20 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Tributary to Spring Brook Creek exits pond on east side, flows north to Spring Brook Creek, into the East Branch DuPage River, then into the DuPage River, and finally into the Des Plaines River (TNW).

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

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.

Tributary stream order, if known: 3.

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

Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: .
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: Piping of historic flow route of tributary.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: 1 feet
Average depth: 0.5 feet
Average side slopes: **Vertical (1:1 or less).**

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: Stable pipe.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: Absent.

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1 %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20 (or greater)**

Describe flow regime: Pond is drained by piped tributary throughout most of spring, as well as summer; and also after heavy rain events. Recreational fishing pond holds water and slowly discharges after rain events for several days.

Other information on duration and volume: .

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined.** Characteristics: Concrete pipe.

Subsurface flow: **No.** Explain findings: .

Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (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;
 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: Water is clear.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(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: 2.25 acres

Wetland type. Explain: Pond with wetland fringe.

Wetland quality. Explain: Moderate; used for recreational fishing and other uses by Park District.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Intermittent flow**. Explain: Seasonal flow into tributary.

Surface flow is: **Overland sheetflow**

Characteristics: Large pond surface drains to east.

Subsurface flow: **No**. 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 **20-25** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **15-20** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Wetland to navigable waters**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **50 - 100-year** 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: Water is clear, utilized by ducks and geese, and full of pan fish.

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: Fishing done in pond by locals.
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: Waterfowl frequent the pond.

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **1**

Approximately (2.25) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
#2	Y	2.25			

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: Wetland 2 (approx. 2.25 ac.) was originally excavated out of hydric soil in a low spot in the landscape. The wetland is adjacent and contiguous to a piped tributary to Spring Brook Creek, which has seasonal relative permanent flow, and exhibits a surface water connection to a traditional navigable waterway. This surface water connection demonstrates the ability of the tributary to carry pollutants, flood waters, nutrients and organic carbon to the TNW. The adjacent wetlands have the ability to reduce the amount of pollutants and floodwaters reaching the TNW. The headwater wetland is receiving a percentage of it's water from groundwater and from runoff from the surrounding uplands before it flows into Des Plaines River. Wetlands such as these provide stormwater storage, habitat, sediment/toxicant retention and nutrient removal/transformation. The decrease of sedimentation, pollutants, flooding, nutrients and habitat provided by the subject wetland provides a positive effect to the downstream relatively permanent waters and traditional navigable waters. .

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: The wetland is adjacent and contiguous to a tributary to Spring Brook Creek, which has seasonal relative permanent flow, and exhibits a surface water connection to a traditional navigable waterway. This surface water connection demonstrates the ability of the tributary to carry pollutants, flood waters, nutrients and organic carbon to the TNW. The adjacent wetlands have the ability to reduce the amount of pollutants and floodwaters reaching the TNW. The headwater wetland is receiving a percentage of it's water from groundwater and from runoff from the surrounding uplands before it flows into Des Plaines River. Wetlands such as these provide stormwater storage, habitat, sediment/toxicant retention and nutrient removal/transformation. The decrease of sedimentation, pollutants, flooding, nutrients and habitat provided by the subject wetland provides a positive effect to the downstream relatively permanent waters and traditional navigable waters. The wetland alone, and in combination with other area wetlands, significantly affect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Des Plaines River. Stomwater storage provided by the subject wetlands affect the frequency and extent of downstream flooding, decreasing flood peaks in the Des Plaines River, and in turn impacting navigation and downstream bank erosion and sedimentation. The sediment and pollutant/toxicant retention provided by the subject wetland has a direct positive effect on the Des Plaines River in regards to navigation and aquatic food webs that are not adapted to thrive in sediment-choked environments. These factors contribute to the finding of a significant nexus between the on-site wetland and the TNW.

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:
 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-RPWs⁸ 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: 5 linear feet 1 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:
 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 jurisdictional. 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: 2.25 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

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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*.

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: 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: 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: CBBEL Wetland Assessment Report dated March 23, 2016.
- 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: Wheaton HA 148, 1965, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Wheaton 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage County, Illinois (1999).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Wheaton, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, 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 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: The subject recreational pond was excavated in hydric soil, and owned and operated by the Wheaton Park District as a recreational fishing pond, and as an asthetic water feature. The area historically had some form of surface water connection to the north to Spring Brook Creek, less than 1 mile away; and this connection is now piped, with strong flow observed at the time of my site visit.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 16, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Cantigny Park, LRC-2016-258

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SE Corner of Route 38 & Winfield Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **DuPage** City: Winfield

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.85494°N, Long. -88.15598° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Spring Brook Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Des Plaines River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Des Plaines (07120004)**

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: April 25, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): April 21, 2016

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 waters² (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: 2.25 acres.

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

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**.

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": .

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: Spring Brook Creek just off site flows year-round, and 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: **Wetland #15 has a direct outflow connection into Spring Brook Creek, and there is no separation.**
 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: **2.25** 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: CBBEL Wetland and Waters of the U.S. Assessment Report dated August 26, 2015.
 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: Naperville HA 154, 1965,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Naperville 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage County, Illinois (1999).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Naperville,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, 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 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): Site also reviewed earlier by DuPage County DEC.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Wetland #15 has a direct flow and connection to Spring Brook Creek.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 13, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, City of Rolling Meadows, LRC-2016-317

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Barker Avenue over Salt Creek

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Rolling Meadows
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.06392°N, Long. -88.01934° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Salt Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Des Plaines River**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Des Plaines (07120004)**

- 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: May 13, 2016
 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: 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 waters² (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: 500 linear feet: 10 width (ft) and/or _____ acres.
Wetlands: 0.25 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**.

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": _____

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: Salt Creek is a direct tributary of the Des Plaines River, and is mapped as a blue-line stream on USGS.
 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: **500** linear feet **10** 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: **Wetland extends on both sides of the creek from the bank.**
 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: **0.25** 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: CBBEL Wetland/Waters Assessment Report dated May 5, 2015.
 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: Palatine HA 87, 1964,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palatine 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage and Part of Cook (1979).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Palatine,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): 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 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: Salt creek is an RPW, and the wetlands directly abut it on both banks.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): April 13, 2016**
B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Chicago River, LRC-2013-161
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Chicago River: Main Branch, South Branch, South Fork of South Branch, North Branch, and North Branch Canal.

State: Illinois County: **Cook, Lake** City: Multiple
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.048002 ° N, Long. -87.7813892 ° W.
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Chicago River**
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Chicago (07120003)**

Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.

- D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION: Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 8/17/2015**

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are** "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.

- Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.
Explain: The Main Branch, South Branch, South Fork of South Branch, and the North Branch of the Chicago River are designated as navigable waterways 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). The North Branch Canal was created in the middle 1800's as a source of clay for the nearby brickyards. The North Shore Channel is navigable-in-fact.

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.

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area: TNWs, including territorial seas

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

Non-wetland waters: 2606600 linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM.

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 Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Chicago River, including the Main Branch, South Branch, South Fork of South Branch, North Branch, and the North Branch Canal.**

Summarize rationale supporting determination: The Main Branch, South Branch, South Fork of South Branch, and the North Branch of the Chicago River are defined as a navigable waterway 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). The North Branch Canal was created in the mid 1800's as a source of clay for the brickyards.

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: 2606600 linear feet width (ft), Or, 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: See below.

Corps navigable waters' study:

U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:

USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.

U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Multiple 7.5" quads.

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: multiple.

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)

Other information (please specify): The North Branch Canal was created in the mid 1800's as a source of clay for the brickyards. The North Shore Channel is navigable-in-fact.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):** May 23, 2016
- B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, **Fox River, LRC-2016-290**
- C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** The Fox River within the Chicago District, USACE
State: Illinois County: **Lake, McHenry, Kane** City: Multiple
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.0483048 ° N, Long. -88.2915890 ° W.
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Fox River and Chain of Lakes**
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Upper Fox (07120006), Lower Fox (07120007)**
 Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
- D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION: Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 8/17/2015**

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are** "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.

- 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.

1. Waters of the U.S.

- a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:** TNWs, including territorial seas
- b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:**
Non-wetland waters: 387544 linear feet: width (ft) and/or 10800 acres.
- c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on:** **Established by OHWM.**
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: **Fox River and the Chain of Lakes.**

Summarize rationale supporting determination: The Fox River is defined as a navigable waterway 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).

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: 387544 linear feet width (ft), Or, 10800 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: See Below.
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: .
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Multiple 7.5" quads.
- 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: multiple.
- 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)
- Other information (please specify): .

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 23, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Subodh Raniwala, LRC-2016-290

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: West End of Lindburgh Drive

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Lake** City: Lake Barrington

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.20701°N, Long. -88.1922° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Fox River

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: May 23, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): May 6, 2016

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are** "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 waters² (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: 5.41 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: **Fox River**.

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

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).

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent": The subject wetland shares a border with the Fox River for over 300 linear feet, and there is no separation between the river and the wetland.

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: 300 linear feet 100 width (ft), Or, acres.
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: 5.41 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: .

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: .
 - 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.

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: May 6, 2016.
- Corps navigable waters' study: Fox River Chain O'Lakes.
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Barrington HA 150, 1965, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Barrington 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Lake County, Illinois (2005).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Barrington, .
- 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): 2000, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014.
or Other (Name & Date): Lake County Planning and Development photos; Corps of Engineers photos.
- 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: Site visit on May 6, 2016 to view wetland abutting Fox River, document wetland with data point, and document fill material in wetland and river.