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): November 23, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, KDOT-Longmeadow Parkway, LRC-2013-839

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Longmeadow Parkway from Randall Road to Route 25
   State: Illinois City: Huntley
   County/parish/borough: Kane
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.139471°N, Long. -88.278692°W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Fox River
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Fox River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Upper Fox (07120006)
   Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
   Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc…) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 02 May 2014
   Field Determination. Date(s): 23 April 2014

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: Several of the 25 wetlands investigated were found to be isolated depressions with no surface water connection to any flowing water of the U.S. Entire road corridor project was walked during an 8 hour period, and each wetland was individually assessed.

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: 3.45 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 Huff & Huff.

☒ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.

☒ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. October 2013 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.


☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).

☐ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Crystal Lake, .

☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Kane County ADID, Pick List, .

☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .

100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)

☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): 2012.

☐ 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: Sites 1B, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23 and 31 were all field verified to be isolated.

☒ Area(s) are geographically isolated. All of these sites are small isolated depressional pockets.

☐ Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. None of these sites are near any flowing water of the U.S..

☐ 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. All of these sites are depressional features that pond water. .

☒ Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. .

2
This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 5, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, ComEd, LRC-2014-295

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: North and South of I-88, East of Eola Road
   State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: DuPage  City: Naperville
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.804597°N, Long. -88.230236°W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Waubonsie Creek
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Fox River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Upper Fox (07120006)
   Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
   Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc…) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   - Office (Desk) Determination. Date: May 13, 2014
   - Field Determination. Date(s): May 6, 2014

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: Eight wetlands were investigated, and all were found to be localized isolated depressions with no pipes or overland connection to any flowing Water of the U.S.

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: 2.45 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:

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below):

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: CBBEL.
- 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: Naperville, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): October 2011.
- or Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: LRC-2013-461 for wetlands 4 & 5.
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): Field visit with CBBEL on May 6, 2014.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Wetlands are in area of multiple isolated depressional pockets surrounded by heavy residential development, and no nearby flowing water of the U.S.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. All wetlands are isolated depressional pockets with no outlets.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. No water flows out of the subject wetlands to any other area.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. No nearby waterway.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. All water pockets on-site.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. All areas are depressional features.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. No nearby waterway or floodplain.
This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 8, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Liberty Trust Property, LRC-2014-320

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: North of I-90, West of Wolf Road
   State: Illinois    County/parish/ borough: Cook    City: Des Plaines
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.01464°N, Long. -87.91471°W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Des Plaines River
   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 in a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   ☒ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 20 May 2014
   ☒ Field Determination. Date(s): 19 May 2014

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 wetland is a low area between an industrial park, a railroad bed, and the Tollway embankment that ponds as it has no outlet or any other connection to a flowing water of the U.S.

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: 1.5 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. April 28, 2014
  - 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: Arlington Heights 7.5" , 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List.
  - USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey, Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage and Part of Cook (1979).
  - National wetlands inventory map(s), Cite name: Arlington Heights,
  - 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:
  - 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. USGS shows depressional isolated feature.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. All water drains into the site; no outlets around wetland.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. Compacted soil in highly developed zone.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain.
SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 22, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Alina Zaucha, LRC-2014-352

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 934 W Ellis Street
State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: Cook  City: Palatine
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.104371°N, Long. -88.067109° 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: June 13, 2014
☐ Field Determination. Date(s): June 9, 2014

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
There are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
☐ Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
☐ Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
There are “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.
   a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): 1
      ☐ TNWs, including territorial seas
      ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      ☐ Relatively permanent waters (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☒ Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

   b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:
      Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
      Wetlands: 14.5 acres.

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

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS
A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs
The agencies will assert jurisdiction over TNWs and wetlands adjacent to TNWs. If the aquatic resource is a TNW, complete Section III.A.1 and Section III.D.1. only; if the aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.2.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

1. TNW
   Identify TNW: Pick List

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

---
1 Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.
2 For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least “seasonally” (e.g., typically 3 months).
D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

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

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - ☒ Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: The wetland is drained out via a piped connection to Salt Creek. This pipe drains the localized depression that takes both surface runoff and subsurface flow from the surrounding hillslopes; and water is continuously fed into the wetland and continuously drained out to Salt Creek, and therefore typically flows year-round.
   - □ Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:

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

3. **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:

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

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply) - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below:
   - ☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: DK Environmental Services, Inc wetland 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 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
   - □ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Palatine, .
   - □ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List, .
   - □ FEMA/FIRM maps:
   - □ 100-year Floodplain Elevation: (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: This large wetland has both a small continuous pipe outflow, as well as a grated structure to accommodate flood flows; and is a large depressional area surrounded by dense residential development which contributes to multiple water inputs that has it connect to Salt Creek, which is a tributary of the Des Plaines River (TNW).