

**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): October 17, 2013**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, Hartz Construction Company, LRC-2013-751

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** Laraway Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: Will City: New Lenox  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.487460°N, Long. -87.913120° W.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Jackson 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: November 4, 2013  
 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):<sup>1</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.  
Explain: **There is one shallow depressional small farmed wetland in the SW prortion of the site. There are no surface or sub-surface water connections to any flowing Waters 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):<sup>2</sup>**

- 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.

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>2</sup> 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: 0.70 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 dated September 3, 2013.
- 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:Manhattan HA 211, 1966, .
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Manhattan 7.5", 1990, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Will County, Illinois (2004).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Manhattan, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: Panel 310, Effective September 6, 1995.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): .  
or  Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:**

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. Wetland is shallow depressional impoundment against roadway.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. Water does not flow out of this shallow wetland.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Site is over a mile from the nearest creek.
- 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.

**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): 10/25/2013**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, LRC-2013-714, Regency Parkway

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** East of Farm Hill Road, South of Regency Square Parkway

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Huntley  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.14756°N, Long. -88.43837° W.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: South Branch of the 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: 10/25/2013
- 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):<sup>1</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: **Wetlands 5 (1.90 ac), 6 (0.27ac), 7 (0.45ac onsite) are closed depressional features with no hydrologic or ecologic connection to a jurisdictional waterway. The South Branch of the Kishwaukee River is the closest drainage feature, and is over 3,000 feet away. Wetlands between the project site and the river were found to be isolated in a previous jurisdictional determination. ..**

**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):<sup>2</sup>**

- 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: 2.62 acres.

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>2</sup> 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: 2.62 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: .
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
  - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:Huntley HA 361, 1971, .
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Huntley 7.5", 1992, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Huntley, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Kane County ADID, NRCS Swampbuster Map, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: 17089C0040H.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): 2011.  
or  Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: LRC-2012-274 5/17/2012,WLs north of this site not JD. Kishwaukee River is JD.
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** Closest river or jurisdictional area is over 3,000 feet away. A previous jurisdictional determination for the property just north of this project area found wetlands to be isolated. This area was previously farmed and then partially graded.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. .
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. No known connection to surface water or drain tiles. .
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. area not ecologically significant, abandoned farmland and partially graded, it is adjacent to subdivision.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. no evidence of a swale nor drain tile.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. .
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. Nearest floodplain is associated with the South Branch of the Kishwaukee River, which is over 3,000 feet away.

**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): September 20, 2013**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, Ide Family Limited Partnership, LRC-2013-675

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** North of 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, east of Woodward Avenue

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **DuPage** City: Downers Grove  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.73996°N, Long. -88.02430° W.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Prentiss 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: 23 September 2013  
 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):<sup>1</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.  
Explain: **Wetlands 1, 2 and 3 (0.50 acres) are all small isolated depressions with no surface water connection to any flowing water of the U.S.; and therefore are 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):<sup>2</sup>**

- 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.

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>2</sup> 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: 0.5 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: CBBEL Wetland Exhibit.
- 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: Lombard HA 143, 1964, .
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Lombard 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage County, Illinois (1999).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Lombard, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: 17043C0907H.
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): .  
or  Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: All wetlands are geographically isolated depressions.**

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. The tree farm is surrounded by heavy residential development; and one of the last open land parcels in the area.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. No creeks are within several miles of the site.
- 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.

**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): September 17, 2013**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, LRC-2013-673, Bridgeview Fueling Station

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** SE corner of Harlem Avenue and W 75<sup>th</sup> Street  
State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Bridgeview  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.75440°N, Long. -87.79872° 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 on a different JD form.

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 09 October 2013

Field Determination. Date(s): 08 October 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):<sup>1</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.  
Explain: **The large approximate 4 acre forested flat woods is a shallow depressional isolated remnant pocket of wetland surrounded by roads and parks; and abuts the Bridgeview Prairie to the south, which is also isolated. There are no connections to any flowing water of the U.S. or any other outlets; the site ponds and then water evaporates or transpires only. Therefore, the subject wetland 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):<sup>2</sup>**

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.

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>2</sup> 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: 4 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: C.M. Lavoie & Associates, Inc.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. July 2013
  - 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: Palos Park HA 145, 1966, .
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palos Park 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: Palos Park, .
- 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 case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Entire wetland boundary was walked on-site and off-site to the south; no connections of any kind were found.**

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. **Shallow isolated depressional pocket.**
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. **No outlets were located.**
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Des Plaines River is several miles to the west/southwest.
- 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.

**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): August 28, 2013**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, Mid-Iron Golf Club, LRC-2013-632

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** West of Bell Road, South of McCarthy Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Lemont  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.65850°N, Long. -87.93614° W.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Calumet Sag Channel

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Calumet-Sag Channel**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Little Calumet-Galien (04040001)**

- 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: 09 October 2013  
 Field Determination. Date(s): 08 October 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):<sup>1</sup>**

- Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.  
Explain: **The subject wetland with an excavated pond at the SE corner of the complex is a shallow depressional wetland feature in a rolling landscape; and there are no outlets or other connection to any flowing water of the U.S.; therefore the subject wetland 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):<sup>2</sup>**

- 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.

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>2</sup> 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 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: Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.
- 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:Sag Bridge HA 149, 1966, .
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Sag Bridge 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: Sag Bridge, .
- 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 case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The subject wetland is surrounded by hills many feet in elevation; everything drains to this low spot which has no outlets.**

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. The subject wetland is in a depression surrounded by hills.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. Large depressional bowl feature in the landscape.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Wetland is surrounded by golf course, farm fields and subdivisions.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. Water ponds in depression, which is why they dug a pond in this location.
- Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. All water flows into this depressional pocket from all sides.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. .

**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): 9/27/2013**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, LRC-2013-532, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** South of Fabyan Parkway and East of Kirk Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: Kane \ DuPage City: Winfield Township, near Batavia

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.86087°N, Long. -88.26116° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Unnamed tributary to Kress 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: 7/24/2006, 9/27/2013

Field Determination. Date(s): 6/8/2006

**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):<sup>1</sup>**

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.

Explain: **Two farmed wetlands exist in the project area, and total about 5 acres in size. They are closed depressional features with no sign of hydrologic connection to the tributary south of the railroad tracks (neither surfac nor subsurface flow). These wetlands were previously determined to be isolated in 2006. A wetland consultant reevaluated the area in June of 2013 and determined there is no change to the delineation that was submitted in 2006.**

**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):<sup>2</sup>**

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.

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>2</sup> 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: 4.98 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: applicant did not submit any maps nor a delineation, however all maps and a delineation were present in LRC-2006-464, a previous determination of the same area.
- 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. no new delineation was submitted
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:Aurora North HA 70, 1963, .
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Aurora North 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Aurora North, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Kane County ADID, NRCS Swampbuster Map, DuPage County Wetland Inventory.
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): .  
or  Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: LRC-2006-464 all wetlands were determined to be isolated in a letter dated July 26, 2006.
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** All areas previously determined to be isolated. No wetlands nor hydrology present on the following: NWI, Kane ADID, DuPage Wetland Inventory, NRCS Swampbuster, FEMA FIRM, USGS Hyrdologic Atlas. A previous field visit did not find any signs of surface nor subsurface flow. As typical of farmed wetlands, vegetative quality is very low. The detention basins to the north are constructed and not within the project area.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. pocket depressions. Farmed wetland 1 has a well defined depression. Upland farmland persists between the wetlands and the tributary.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. No surface water connection .
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Farmed wetlands do not provide ecological habitat.
- 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. Any sheetflow would be a rare occurrence.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. no floodplain on FEMA FIRM in the project area.

**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): 10/11/2013**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, LRC-2013-156, KDOT Kirk & Fabyan

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** Kirk Rd & Fabyan Parkway  
State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Geneva and Batavia  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.86895°N, Long. -88.27923° W.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Tributary to White's 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: 10/11/2013

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):<sup>1</sup>**

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.

Explain: **WL1(0.03ac), FWL1(0.11ac), WL7(0.02ac), WL8(0.06ac), WL9(0.01ac), WL10(0.01ac), WL11(0.07ac), WL12(0.06ac), WL13(0.06ac), FWL2(0.12ac) are all closed depressional wetlands. No hydrologic connection was observed in the field. These areas include all wetlands on the northeast, and both southern corners of the intersection.**

**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):<sup>2</sup>**

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: 0.50 acres.

<sup>1</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

<sup>2</sup> 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: 0.5 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: Wetland Delineation dated December 19, 2012.
- 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. out of season, and we do not verify isolated wetland boundaries
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:Aurora North HA 70, 1963, .
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Aurora North 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Aurora North, .
- 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): 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2009.  
or  Other (Name & Date): delineation and site visit.
- 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:** All wetlands both south of Fabyan Parkway and east of Kirk Road are isolated depressions with no connection to jurisdictional areas. No culverts or pipes were observed at or south of Fabyan Parkway. One culvert was observed on Kirk Road as overflow for a detention basin towards but not connecting to wetland 5, and would only carry water during extreme storm events since it was located at least 10 feet above water level after a storm event - and it was completely dry.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. Field visit was unable to observe any hydrologic connection..
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Low quality wetlands, many farmed.
- 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. Any overland sheet flow could only flow from the northeast corner to the northwest corner through a culvert that was many feet above aquatic resources on the northwest corner, and thus would only occur during rare extreme storm events. Site visit was the day after a rain, and no evidence of overland sheetflow was observed.
- Area(s) are not located within the flood plain. Over 1 mile to closest mapped floodplain.