

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): 6/6/2013

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2013-175, Lexington Club Subdivision

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: East of 12th St., North of Dean St.

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: St. Charles
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.91543°N, Long. -88.32399° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: State Street Creek

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Lower Fox (07120007)**

- 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: 6/6/2013
 Field Determination. Date(s): 5/21/2013

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: **Wetland 1 is 0.27 acres and Wetland 2 is 0.35 acres. Both are low quality and have no connection to a jurisdictional waterway. Neither maps nor a field visit were able to show any connection to a jurisdictional waterway.**

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: 0.62 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 Assessment.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Geneva HA 142, 1965, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Geneva 7.5", 1993, Geneva 15", 1932, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Geneva, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Kane County ADID, NRCS Swampbuster Map, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): .
or Other (Name & Date): Site photos.
- 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 area around the wetlands includes demolished buildings, old fill, vegetation on old fill, and a dirt access road to the south which lies between the wetlands and State Street Creek. There is a small intermittent drainage feature between the two wetlands, but no connection could be found in the field between the wetlands and the creek.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. About 100 feet from the creek, no connection found in field.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. There was a dirt road between the wetlands and the creek. There were no signs of pipes, swales, nor gullies connecting them. There were no tire ruts in the dirt road..
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Wetlands are low quality, and are surrounded by a dirt road, old fill, and a demolished industrial complex. This area appears to have been heavily modified..
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. compacted dirt road downhill, field day was day after storm - areas were dry. No tire ruts existed in the dirt road between the wetlands and creek..
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. No swales nor gullies. Dirt road was dry day after storm.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. The nearby (RPW) creek is, but the wetlands are not.

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): 6/6/2013

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2012-896, Plank Road Realignment Project

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Plank Road, Burlington Road, South of French Road
State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Burlington
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.05399°N, Long. -88.54558° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Tributary to Burlington Creek

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Kishwaukee (07090006)**

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

Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc...) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 6/6/2013

Field Determination. Date(s): 5/21/2013

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: **Site 1 (0.13 ac), Site 4 (0.12 ac), and Site 5 (0.05 ac) are closed depressional isolated wetlands.**

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: 0.31 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 Investigation 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: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:Hampshire HA 459, 1972, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Hampshire 7.5", 1968, Genoa 15", 1938, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Hampshire, .
- 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): 1991,1995,1996,1997,1998,2001,1939.
or Other (Name & Date): site photos.
- 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 1, 4, and 5 are depressional isolated wetlands with no hydrologic connection to jurisdictional areas.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. Sites 1 and 4 are very far from any jurisdictional areas. Site 5 closest, and is about 500 feet from the jurisdictional site 3 .
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. There is no hydrologic connection. There is no evidence water flows out anywhere.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Sites 4 and 5 are in agriculture. Site 1 extends offsite however the entire wetland appears to be geographically isolated..
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. No evidence seen in field.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. These wetlands only receive sheet flow.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. Not on FEMA map.

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

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 28, 2013

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Todd Schmid, LRC-2013-394

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Haligus Road, south of Rt. 176.

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **McHenry** City: Woodstock
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.2847°N, Long. -88.4029° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Kishwaukee River

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Kishwaukee (07090006)**

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

Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc...) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: June 10, 2013

Field Determination. Date(s): June 7, 2013

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 16.5 acre total wetland (on-site and off-site) is a large depressional feature in a rolling topographic area. The subject wetland area has no outlets or other connections to any flowing waters of the U.S., and therefore is isolated and non-jurisdictional.**

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: 16.5 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: McConnell Environmental 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: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Huntley HA 361, 1971, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Huntley 7.5", 1992, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of McHenry County, Illinois (2001).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Huntley, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): McHenry County ADID, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2003, 2008.
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): Site visit on June 7, 2013 to walk entire wetland boundary, with no connections or outlets located. The subject wetland was emergent in the central portions, and ponded at the time of my visit; while the outer ring of the wetland was dominated by cottonwoods, and showed evidence of recent ponding. The habitat structure and vegetation was consistent with a depressional isolated wetland that ponds during flooding, and then slowly recedes to the deeper central portion, leaving a dryer ring of vegetation.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. Topographic map shows depressional topography.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. Areas are shown as isolated ponds near the watershed break.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Area surrounded by farm fields and housing developments.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. Nothing on maps, or found during site visit.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. Area is in a large depressional bowl, with all water flowing into the site.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. Well outside the floodplain of the Kishwaukee River per the hydrologic atlas.

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

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 20, 2013

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Anchor Self-Storage, LRC-2013-380

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 39406 N. Lewis Avenue

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Lake** City: Beach Park
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.43471°N, Long. -88.85718° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Dead River

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

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 10, 2013

Field Determination. Date(s): June 7, 2013

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 pond, which is man-made, but has naturalized, is an isolated depression that only outlets water to the south and into a detention basin constructed for the storage facility during rain events. The exempt detention basin has no outlet pipes at all; and is approximately 4-5 feet deep. A review of 20 years of aerial photographs show the pond full of water, but the detention basin completely dry. Even during the historic rain events, this basin did not overtop or otherwise make a connection to the start of the tributary which is located to the south. The detention basin is excavated out of heavy clay material which is impervious, so there is also no possible sub-surface connection. Therefore, the subject pond is considered isolated and non-jurisdictional.**

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: 1 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: DK 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:
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Waukegan HA 234, 1967,
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Waukegan 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Lake County, Illinois (2005).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Waukegan,
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Lake County ADID, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: 17097C0086G.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 1998, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011.
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): Site visit on June 7, 2013 to investigate property and drainage.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. Pond was excavated, and is near watershed break, so doesn't take on much water.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. Pond only overflows during significant rain events, and drains to detention basin with no outlets.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. Detention basin is impervious clay.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain.