
FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-501      PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: ☑ Office ☑ Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:
☑ There are no waters on the project site.
☐ There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
☑ There are waters of the United States on the project site.
☐ There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

☐ There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
☐ The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
☑ The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹), (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
☐ The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US, (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
☐ The presence of wetlands adjacent (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands, (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
☐ The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
☐ Other:
☐ Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed
☑ U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: WHEATON.
☑ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for DuPage County.
☐ U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
☐ U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
☐ Aerial Photographs (Name & Date):
☐ Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: DUPAGE COUNTY..
☐ Site Visit Conducted on, May 8, 2007
☐ Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The hydrology from the onsite wetland area and drainage ditch flows west through the property. The water moves under Illinois Route 53 via culvert, then via an excavated roadside ditch along the exit/entrance ramp to Ogden Avenue. A drainage ditch along the ramp discharges into the East Branch DuPage River via a culvert through the levee. The East Branch DuPage River flows to the Des Plaines River which is a section 10 waters of the U.S.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

☐ Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
☑ clear, natural line impressed on the bank
☐ the presence of litter and debris
☐ changes in the character of soil
☑ wetland boundary
☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☐ shelving
☐ other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

☐ Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
☐ Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
☐ Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

☐ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries
☑ This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated June 2007, prepared by Planning Resources.
☐ This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: ________________________________ Date: __________

Approved by: ________________________________ Date: __________

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): 20 Nov 2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2007-519, Dan Lazar

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Illinois   County/parish/borough: Lake   City: Spring Grove
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.413823°N, Long. -88.190084° W. Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Nippersink Lake
   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: 20 Nov 2007
   ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

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
         ☒ 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: 83 linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
         Wetlands: acres.

      c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM.
         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: Fox Chain-of-Lakes.


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
   (a) Relationship with TNW:
   □ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
   □ Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.

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

   Identify flow route to TNW:\(^2\):
   Tributary stream order, if known:

---

\(^1\) Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

\(^2\) 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.
(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):

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

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

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
☐ Silts  
☐ Sands  
☐ Concrete  
☐ Cobbles  
☐ Gravel  
☐ Muck  
☐ Bedrock  
☐ Vegetation. Type/% cover:  
☐ Other. Explain:  

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

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: Pick List  
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List  
Describe flow regime:  
Other information on duration and volume:  
Surface flow is: Pick List. Characteristics:  
Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:  
☐ Dye (or other) test performed:  

Tributary has (check all that apply):
☐ Bed and banks
☐ OHWM* (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:
☐ oil or scum line along shore objects  
☐ Mean High Water Mark indicated by:  
☐ fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)  
☐ survey to available datum;  
☐ 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:  
Identify specific pollutants, if known:  

---

*A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody’s flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

7Ibid.
(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
☐ Habitat for:
☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

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

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

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: Pick List. Explain:
Surface flow is: Pick List
Characteristics:
☐ Dye (or other) test performed:

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

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

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

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

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List
Approximately ( ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - [ ] Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:
   - [ ] 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:

5
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
☐ Tributary waters: \( \text{linear feet} \) width (ft).
☐ Other non-wetland waters: \( \text{acres} \).
Identify type(s) of waters: __________.

3. **Non-RPWs** 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 in 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: \( \text{linear feet} \) width (ft).
☐ Other non-wetland waters: \( \text{acres} \).
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: \( \text{acres} \).

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 in jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: \( \text{acres} \).

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: \( \text{acres} \).

7. **Impoundments of jurisdictional waters**.
☐ 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).

8. **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)**:
☐ 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: __________.

---

*See Footnote # 3.*

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

*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 referenced 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: Fox Chain-O-Lakes navigation study.
☐ USGS NHD data.
☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Fox Lake 7.5”, 1993, Pick List, Pick List.
☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.
☐ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List.
☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List.
☐ FEMA/FIRM maps:
☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date):
☐ Other (Name & Date):
☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
☐ Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Nippersink Lake is part of the navigable in-fact Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.
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): 20 Nov 2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2007-518, Arnie Ommundson

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Illinois           County/parish/borough: Lake                City: Spring Grove
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.413823°N, Long. -88.190084° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Nippersink Lake
   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: 20 Nov 2007
   ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

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.

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: 83 linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
      - Wetlands: acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM.
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): 2
   ☐ 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: Fox Chain-of-Lakes.


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
      (a) Relationship with TNW:
          ☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
          ☐ Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.

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

          Identify flow route to TNW:
          Tributary stream order, if known:

---

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

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

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

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
- Silts
- Sands
- Concrete
- Cobbles
- Gravel
- Muck
- Bedrock
- Vegetation. Type/% cover:
- Other. Explain:

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain:

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **Pick List**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

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

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

Tributary has (check all that apply):
- Bed and banks
- OHWM® (check all indicators that apply):
  - clear, natural line impressed on the bank
  - changes in the character of soil
  - shelving
  - vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
  - leaf litter disturbed or washed away
  - sediment deposition
  - water staining
  - other (list):
- Discontinuous OHWM.® 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
- fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
- physical markings/characteristics
- tidal gauges
- other (list):

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

---

®A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody’s flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

®Ibid.
(iv) **Biological Characteristics.** Channel supports (check all that apply):

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics:
- Habitat for:
  - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
  - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
  - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
  - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

(i) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) **General Wetland Characteristics:**

Properties:
- Wetland size: acres
- Wetland type. Explain:
- Wetland quality. Explain:

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) **General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:**

Flow is: **Pick List.** Explain:

Surface flow is: **Pick List.**

Characteristics:

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

(c) **Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:**

- Directly abutting
- Not directly abutting
  - Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:
  - Ecological connection. Explain:
  - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) **Proximity (Relationship) to TNW**

Project wetlands are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List.**

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** floodplain.

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.). Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iii) **Biological Characteristics.** Wetland supports (check all that apply):

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain:
- Habitat for:
  - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
  - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
  - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
  - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

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

   Approximately (_____) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. **SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - [ ] Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:
   - [ ] Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
☐ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
  Identify type(s) of waters:

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

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

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
☐ Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2. above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:

☐ 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: acres.

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

E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): 10
☐ which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
☐ from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
☐ which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
☐ Interstate isolated waters. Explain:
☐ Other factors. Explain:

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

---

8See Footnote # 3.
9To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guido booklet.
10Prior 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.
- 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:
- 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:
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List.
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):
- or Other (Name & Date):
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Nippersink Lake is part of the navigable in-fact Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.
APPLICANT: Univerision Radio  PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: South of 127th Street and Wentworth Avenue in Calumet Park, Cook County, Illinois. (Section 28, Township 37 North, Range 14 East)

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-413  PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: ☒ Office ☐ Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:
- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:
- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(4))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands), (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: ____________.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: ____________.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: ____________.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: ____________.
- Aerials (Name & Date): Google Earth as accessed on November 7, 2007.
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: ____________.
- Site Visit Conducted on:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Wetland 1, 2, 3 and 4, as referenced in your delineation report, are adjacent to the Little Calumet River, a navigable water.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
- clear, natural line impressed on the bank  ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- the presence of litter and debris  ☐ shelving
- changes in the character of soil  ☐ other:
- wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:
- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
- Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

☐ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries
☒ This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated May 21, 2007, prepared by STS Consultants.
☐ This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____________________________ Date: ______/____/____

Approved by: ___________________________ Date: ______/____/____

---

1 Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.
APPLICANT: Casey Wojlaw

PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: 28618 W. Channel Drive, Ingleside, Lake County, Illinois / Pistakee Lake

FILE NUMBER: LR-2007-329  PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: ☑ Office ☐ Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

☐ There are no waters on the project site.
☐ There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
☒ There are waters of the United States on the project site.
☐ There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

☐ There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
☐ The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 C.F.R. 328.3(a)(1))
☐ The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
☐ The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
☐ The presence of wetlands adjacent1 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
☐ The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
☐ Other:
☒ Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

☒ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: WAUCONDA.
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County.
☒ U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
☒ U.S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
☒ Aerials (Name & Date):
☒ Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: LAKE COUNTY.
☐ Site Visit Conducted on:
☐ Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Pistakee Lake is part of the navigable in-fact Fox River: Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

☐ Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
☒ clear, natural line impressed on the bank
☒ the presence of litter and debris
☒ changes in the character of soil
☒ wetland boundary
☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☒ shelving
☐ other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

☐ Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
☐ Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
☐ Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

☐ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

☐ This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated , prepared by
☒ This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: ___________________________ Date: 19 Nov 07

Approved by: ___________________________ Date:

---

1 Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river bars, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.
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): 19 Nov 2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2007-517, Nancy Alfano

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: Lake  City: Fox Lake
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.382123°N, Long. -88.190138° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
Name of nearest waterbody: Pistakee Lake
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: 19 Nov 2007
☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

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.

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There Are “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.
   a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): 1
      ☒ TNWs, including territorial seas
      ☒ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      ☒ Relatively permanent waters (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☒ 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: 83 linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
      Wetlands: acres.
   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM.
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): 2
   ☐ 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: Fox Chain-of-Lakes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
       (a) Relationship with TNW:
           ☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
           ☐ Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.
           Project waters are Pick List river miles from TNW.
           Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.
           Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
           Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
           Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

   Identify flow route to TNW:
   Tributary stream order, if known:

---

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

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

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

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
☐ Silts
☐ Sands
☐ Concrete
☐ Cobble
☐ Gravel
☐ Muck
☐ Bedrock
☐ Vegetation. Type/cover:
☐ Other. Explain:

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

(c) Flow:
Tributary provides for: Pick List
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List

Describe flow regime:
Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: Pick List. Characteristics:

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

Tributary has (check all that apply):
☐ Bed and banks
☐ OHWM* (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. 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:
Identify specific pollutants, if known:

---

*A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody’s flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

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

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

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

   (b) **General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:**
      Flow is: Pick List. Explain:
      Surface flow is: Pick List
      Characteristics:
      Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:
      - Dye (or other) test performed:

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

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

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

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

3. **Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)**
   All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List
   Approximately ( ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:
   - 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:

5
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
☐ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
Identify type(s) of waters:

3. **Non-RPWs** that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

☐ Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

4. **Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

☐ Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.

☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:

☐ 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: acres.

7. **Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.**

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 isolatec 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):**

☐ 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:

---

5 See Footnote # 3.

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

10 Prior to asserting or declining CWA Jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.
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:

☐ 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:

☐ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Fox Lake HA 151, 1965,

☒ USGS NHD data.

☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.

☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Fox Lake 7.5”, 1993, Pick List, Pick List,

☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.

☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List,

☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List,

☒ FEMA/FIRM maps:

☒ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is:

☐ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date):

☐ Other (Name & Date):

☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:


☑ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:

☐ Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Pistakee Lake is part of the navigable in-fact Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.
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): 19 Nov 2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2007-470, Gustavo Soto

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: Lake  City: Fox Lake
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.381596°N, Long. -88.191536° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Pistakee Lake
   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: 19 Nov 2007
   ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

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.


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: 210 linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
      Wetlands: acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM.
      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: Fox Chain-of-Lakes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW
   (i) General Area Conditions:
      Watershed size: Pick List
      Drainage area: Pick List
      Average annual rainfall: inches
      Average annual snowfall: inches
   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
      (a) Relationship with TNW:
         ☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
         ☐ Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.
         Project waters are Pick List river miles from TNW.
         Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.
         Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
         Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
         Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:
         Identify flow route to TNW:
         Tributary stream order, if known:

---

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

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

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

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
☐ Silts
☐ Sands
☐ Cobble
☐ Gravel
☐ Bedrock
☐ Vegetation. Type% cover:
☐ Other. Explain:

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

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

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

Tributary has (check all that apply):
☐ Bed and banks
☐ OHWM* (check all indicators that apply):
☐ clear, natural line impressed on the bank
☐ changes in the character of soil
☐ shelving
☐ vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
☐ leaf litter disturbed or washed away
☐ sediment deposition
☐ water staining
☐ other (list):

☐ Discontinuous OHWM. 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
☐ fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
☐ physical markings
☐ tidal gauges
☐ other (list):

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

---

*A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody’s flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

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

2. **Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW**
   
   (i) **Physical Characteristics:**
   
   (a) **General Wetland Characteristics:**
   
   Properties:
   - [ ] Wetland size: ___ acres
   - [ ] Wetland type. Explain:
   - [ ] Wetland quality. Explain:
   
   Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

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

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

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

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

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iii) **Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):**

- [ ] Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):
- [ ] Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain:
- [ ] Habitat for:
  - [ ] Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
  - [ ] Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
  - [ ] Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
  - [ ] Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

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

Approximately (___) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:
   - Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow "seasonally" (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
- □ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- □ Other non-wetland waters: acres.
  Identify type(s) of waters:.

3. **Non-RPWs** that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- □ Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

4. **Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

- □ Wetlands directly abut an 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: acres.

7. **Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.**

As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

- □ Demonstrate that impoundment was created from “waters of the U.S.” or
  - Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
  - Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

E. **ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):**

- □ 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:

---

*See Footnote # 3.  
To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.  
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: .
☐ 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: Fox Chain-O-Lakes navigation study.
☐ USGS NHD data.
☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Fox Lake 7.5”, 1993, Pick List, Pick List, .
☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.
☐ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List, .
☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List, .
☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
☐ 100-year Floodplain elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
☐ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): .
☐ or ☒ Other (Name & Date): .
☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
☒ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
☐ Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Pistakee Lake is part of the navigable in-fact Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.
APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Village of Mundelein PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Pleasure Drive and Ridge Avenue, Diamond Lake Drain, Mundelein, Lake County, Illinois

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-373 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: ☑ Office ☐ Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:
☐ There are no waters on the project site.
☐ There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
☒ There are waters of the United States on the project site.
☐ There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

☐ There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
☐ The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
☒ The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1), (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
☒ The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the U.S. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
☐ The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
☐ The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
☐ Other:
☐ Section 10 wateryway.

Information Reviewed
☒ U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: GRAYSLAKE.
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County.
☒ U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: 
☒ U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: 
☐ Aerials (Name & Date):
☐ Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: 
☐ Site Visit Conducted on: 
☐ Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The culverts replacements are to occur along a tributary to Diamond Lake Drain which flows into Indian Creek which drains into the Des Plaines River, a navigable waterway.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

☐ Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
☒ clear, natural line impressed on the bank
☒ the presence of litter and debris
☒ changes in the character of soil
☒ wetland boundary
☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☒ shelving
☐ other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

☐ Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
☐ Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
☐ Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

☐ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

☐ This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated , prepared by .
☒ This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: ___________________________ Date: 11/5/07

☑ Approved by: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

^1 Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.
APPLICANT: Rick Helland  PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Deep Lake/Lake Villa

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2006-1132  PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: ☑ Office ☐ Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:
☒ There are no waters on the project site.
☐ There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
☐ There are waters of the United States on the project site.
☒ There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

☒ There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
☐ The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
☒ The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
☐ The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
☒ The presence of wetlands adjacent2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
☐ The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
☐ Other:
☐ Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed
☐ U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: __________.
☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County.
☐ U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: __________.
☐ U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: __________.
☒ Aerials (Name & Date): Lake County 1939, 2000, 2904, 2005 & 2006; PhotoMapper 2001, 2002 & 2005
☐ Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: LAKE COUNTY.
☐ Site Visit Conducted on: __________.
☐ Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Deep Lake is tributary to the Fox River, a navigable water of the United States, via Sequoit Creek and is therefore also a water of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

☐ Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
☒ clear, natural line impressed on the bank ☒ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☒ the presence of litter and debris ☒ shelving
☐ changes in the character of soil ☒ other
☒ wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

☐ Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
☐ Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
☐ Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

☒ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

☐ This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated __________, prepared by __________.
☒ This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: __________  Date: __________

Approved by: __________  Date: __________

1 Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydric vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.
APPLICANT: Will County Forest Preserve District  PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: between Gougar Road and I-355 Tollway Extension, New Lenox, Will County, Illinois
FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-282  PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED:  ☐ Office  ☒ Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:
☐ There are no waters on the project site.
☐ There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
☒ There are waters of the United States on the project site.
☐ There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

☐ There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
☐ The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
☒ The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands1). (33 CFR 328.3(a)(2))
☒ The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
☒ The presence of wetlands adjacent2  (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
☐ The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
☐ Other:
☐ Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed
☒ U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: MOKENA.
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
☒ U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _________.
☒ Aerials (Name & Date):
☒ Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _________.
☒ Site Visit Conducted on:
☐ Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Spring Creek and associated wetlands are jurisdictional due to a hydrologic connection to Hickory Creek which flows into the Des Plaines River, a navigable waterway.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
☒ clear, natural line impressed on the bank ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☒ the presence of litter and debris ☒ shelving
☐ changes in the character of soil ☐ other:
☒ wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

☐ Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
☐ Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
☐ Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

☐ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries
☒ This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated February 8, 2006, prepared by V3 Consultants.
☐ This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: ___________________________ Date: 01/07/07

Approved by: ___________________________ Date: 

1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.
APPLICANT: Plainfield Park District  PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Clow Steven's 106.5 Acre Property off of Lily Cache Road in Plainfield, Will County, Illinois /Lily-Cache Creek


Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:
- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:
- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.). (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands\(^1\)). (33 CFR 328.3(a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3(a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3(a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: PLAINFIELD.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles:
- U. S. Geological Survey 15-Minute Historic Quadrangles:
- Aerials (Name & Date):
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps:
- Site Visit Conducted on:
- Other information: May 11, 2007 Wetland Delineation Report by JFNew.

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above); The farmed wetland is an extension of Wetland A (unfarmed), which is immediately adjacent to Lily Cache Creek. Wetland B continues off-site to the south and is also immediately adjacent to Lily Cache Creek. Lily Cache Creek flows to the DuPage River, a tributary of the Des Plaines River which is navigable in-fact below the Hoffman Dam in Riverside, Illinois.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):
Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:
- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
- Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries
- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated May 11, 2007, prepared by JFNew.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: ____________________________ Date: 13 NOV 07

Approved by: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

\(^1\)Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).
APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: City of Chicago, DOE  PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Southeast of the intersection of 130th and Torrence Avenue in the City of Chicago, Cook County/Calumet River

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2006-1348  PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: ☐ Office  ☑ Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:
☐ There are no waters on the project site.
☐ There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
☐ There are waters of the United States on the project site.
☒ There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:
☐ There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
☐ The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1)).
☐ The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
☐ The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the U.S. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
☐ The presence of wetlands adjacent to bordering, contiguous, or neighboring to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
☐ The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams including intermittent streams, mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
☐ Other:
☐ Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed
☒ U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: LAKE CALUMET.
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
☒ U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
☒ U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
☒ Aerials (Name & Date): 2001
☒ Site Visit Conducted on: fall 2005
☐ Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Area 1 (a-e) is considered a jurisdictional waters of the U.S. that is adjacent to the Calumet River.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):
Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
☐ clear, natural line impressed on the bank  ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☐ the presence of litter and debris  ☐ shelving
☐ changes in the character of soil  ☐ other:
☐ wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:
☐ Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
☐ Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
☐ Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria

☐ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries
☒ This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated July 20, 2004 (revised November 9, 2004), prepared by V3 Consultants.
☐ This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: __________________________ Date: 11-8-07

Approved by: __________________________ Date: __________________________

1 Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.