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): 10 March 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Mayslake Village, LRC-2014-110

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SW corner of 35th Street and Pasquinelli Drive
   State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: DuPage  City: Oak Brook
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.800833° N, Long. -87.936944° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Salt Creek
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Des Plaines River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Des Plaines (07120004)
   Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
   Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc…) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   ☒ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 10 March 2014
   ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There are no “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

   2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):¹
      ☒ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
      Explain: A small isolated pond exists on the property surrounded by trees, that has no outlet to any flowing water of the U.S.
      ☐ Other factors. Explain: .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

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):²
   ☐ 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: .

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.

¹ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
² 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.
- [x] 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).
- [x] 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):

- [x] Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- [ ] Lakes/ponds: acres.
- [ ] Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:  .
- [x] Wetlands: 0.05 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):

- [x] Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- [ ] Lakes/ponds: acres.
- [ ] Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:  .

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):

- [x] Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Bob Cisek.
- [ ] Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - [ ] Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
  - [x] Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- [x] Data sheets prepared by the Corps.
- [ ] Corps navigable waters’ study.
- [ ] USGS NHD data.
- [x] USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- [x] National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Hinsdale.
- [ ] State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, Pick List.
- [ ] FEMA/FIRM maps:
- [ ] 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
  - or [ ] Other (Name & Date):  .
- [x] Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: 200200612 on May 1, 2002.
- [ ] Applicable/supporting case law:
- [ ] Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- [ ] Other information (please specify):  .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Prior letter states no jurisdictional waters present.

- [x] Area(s) are geographically isolated.
- [x] Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus.
- [x] Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus.
- [x] Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water.
- [x] Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow.
- [x] Area(s) are not located within the flood plain.
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): February 27, 2014
B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Centerpoint Joliet Railroad, LRC-2014-134
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Southwest Corner of CenterPoint Way and Schwitzer Road
   State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: Will  City: Joliet
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.4639° N, Long. -88.1211° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Cedar Creek
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Des Plaines River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Des Plaines (07120004)
   Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
   Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc…) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.
D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 11 March 2014
   Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There Are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There Are no “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]
   2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):1
      Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
      Explain: The subject 12 wetland areas are all isolated pockets scattered throughout the site; and have no surface water connection to the nearby creek.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS
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):2
   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: .

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.

---
1 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
2 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: 1.3 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: Wetland Delineation Report by Ehorn Environmental.
- 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: 
- USGS NHD data. 
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. 
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Elwood 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, 
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Elwood, 
- 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): 2007, 2010. or Other (Name & Date): 
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: 
- Applicable/supporting case law: 
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: 
- Other information (please specify): 

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:
- Area(s) are geographically isolated. All wetlands are distinct depressional pockets with no connection to the creek.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. No apparent flow from wetlands to creek to the west.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain.
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): 10 March 2014
B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Prologis - Road Safe Parcel, LRC-2014-156
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: South of I-55, West of Veterans Parkway
   State: Illinois
   County/parish/borough: Will
   City: Bolingbrook
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.661956° N, Long. -88.105344° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Lily Cache Creek
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Des Plaines River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Des Plaines (07120004)
   Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
   Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc…) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.
D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   ✔ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 17 March 2014
   ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There are no “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]
   2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):1
      ✔ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
      Explain: The wetland is surrounded by mass-graded commercial lots and development. No outlets or connections to any flowing water of the U.S. were located on-site by EnCAP, Inc. during their October 29, 2013 site inspection.
      ☐ Other factors. Explain: .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS
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):2
   ☐ 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: .

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.

---

1 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
2 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: .20 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: EnCAP, Inc. Wetland Delineation Report.
- 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: .
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Romeoville, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2013 Google.
  - or Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The subject shallow depression appears to be originally incidental to construction, but has been abandoned for years; and does not have any connection to any other wetland or water of the U.S.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain.