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 23, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Village of Orland Park, LRC-2014-735

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 143rd Street from Wolf Road to Rt. 45
State: Illinois County/parish/borough: Cook City: Orland Park
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.6305° N, Long. -87.86856° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
Name of nearest waterbody: Spring 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)

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
☑ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: November 4, 2014
☑ Field Determination. Date(s): October 28, 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: Wetlands #9 and #13 are small isolated depressions with no outlet or connection 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):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: 0.17 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 Delineation Report.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
- Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: ______
- Corps navigable waters’ study: ______
- USGS NHD data: ______
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palos Park 7.5”, 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, ______
- 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): 2008, 2012, ______
- 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: *Wetland #9 is a small shallow scrape area impounded by roads and a RR Track; while Wetland #13 is impounded by 143rd and the parking lot, and has no outlet.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. Not near any flowing water body.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. No outlet, both areas are depressional impoundments.
- 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.
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 3, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, IMCC Matteson, LLC, LRC-2014-744

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SW of I-57 and Route 30
   State: Illinois   County/parish/borough: Cook   City: Matteson
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.497° N, Long. -87.7475° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Butterfield 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)

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   Office (Desk) Determination. Date: November 4, 2014
   Field Determination. Date(s): October 28, 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):  
   - Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. 
     Explain: Wetland 3 is a shallow depression in a farm field impounded against the access road; while Wetland 4 is a small depression against the access road with run-off water from the commercial properties to the north. Both of these areas have no flow or outlet 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):  
   - 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.
   - 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: 0.20 acres.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):

☐ Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).

☐ Lakes/ponds: acres.

☐ Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .

☐ Wetlands: acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: CBBEL Wetland Assessment Report dated September 26, 2014.

☒ 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: Steger.

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

☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .

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


☐ 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: *Wetlands #3 and #4 are both small shallow isolated depressions. Neither of these wetlands have a connection to Butterfield Creek, which is to the west.

☒ Area(s) are geographically isolated.

☒ Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. Small isolated depressional pockets, with no water runoff.

☐ 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.
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): 11/6/2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, GEOTHINK, LLC, LRC-2014-794

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: West of Compton Drive and Algonquin Road (Route 62)
   State: Illinois  County/parish/borough: McHenry  City: Algonquin
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.15442°N, Long. -88.26404° 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)

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
   - Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 11/6/2014
   - Field Determination. Date(s): 10/30/2014

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: One small isolated wetland (0.44 acres). This wooded wetland is located in a depressional area with poor drainage.

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.
   - 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: 0.44 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: .
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Crystal Lake, .
- 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): 2012.
  - Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: 200500506, No JD Ltr issued.
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: *Wetland is located in a low area along the northern portion of the property and has no drainage outlet.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. Fox River is 1.2 miles away.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. No connection to the Fox River.
- 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.
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 7, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2014-580, Right Residential

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 166 S. Ela Road
   State: Illinois       County/parish/borough: Cook        City: Palatine
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.13936°N, Long. -88.09914° 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: November 14, 2014
   ☑ Field Determination. Date(s): November 13, 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 has an outlet drainage pipe that leads to a golf course pond. The golf course pond is a small localized isolated depression that collects surrounding drainage, and has no outlet pipe.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

E. ISOLOATED [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: 0.67 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: Bollinger, Lach & Associates, Inc. Wetland Assessment Report.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
  - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study:
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Lake Zurich, .
- 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): 2012.
  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: Drainage was visible flowing from wetland into pond, which is 5-10 feet lower in elevation than surround topography.

- Area(s) are geographically isolated. Localized depressional area with multiple drainage inputs, and no outlets.
- Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. No water flows out of pond.
- Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. Surrounded by golf course and houses.
- 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. Creek is on east side of Ela Road, and over 10 feet higher in elevation.
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 3, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Scott Root, LRC-2014-727

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   - Location: 1519 Hobe Road
   - Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.30558°N, Long. -88.52087° W.
   - Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   - Name of nearest waterbody: North Branch 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: November 26, 2014
   - Field Determination. Date(s): November 20, 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: Wetland 1 is a shallow depressional reed canary grass wetland with no inlets or outlets 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.
- [x] Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.
- [ ] Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in “SWANCC,” the review area would have been regulated based solely on the “Migratory Bird Rule” (MBR).
- [ ] 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: .
- [x] Wetlands: 1.16 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):
- [x] Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Wetland Delineation and Assessment Report by Bollinger, Lach & Associates.
- [x] 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: Marengo North, .
- [ ] State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List, .
- [ ] FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- [ ] 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- [x] Photographs: [x] Aerial (Name & Date): 2008, 2012. 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 not connected to the other on-site wetlands, and has no outlet.
- [x] Area(s) are geographically isolated. .
- [x] Area(s) do not have a hydrologic nexus. .
- [ ] Area(s) do not have an ecological nexus. .
- [ ] Area(s) do not have evidence of a subsurface flow connection to a jurisdictional water. .
- [x] Area(s) do not have evidence of surface overland sheet flow. .
- [x] 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): November 26, 2014

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Joe Orr Road, LRC-2014-554

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: Illinois       County/parish/borough: Cook       City: Lynwood
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. ° N, Long. ° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Pick List
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Pick List
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Pick List
   [☐] 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:
   [☐] Field Determination. Date(s): 15 SEP 14

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

   1. Waters of the U.S.
      a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): ¹
         [☐] TNWs, including territorial seas
         [☐] Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
         [☐] Relatively permanent waters² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         [☐] Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         [☐] Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         [☐] Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         [☐] Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         [☐] Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
         [☐] Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

      b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:
         Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
         Wetlands: 3 = 0.88 , 5 = 0.32 , 6 = 4.17 acres.

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

   2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³
      [☐] Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
      Explain: Wetlands 1 (0.02 acres), Wetland 2 (0.22 acres) and 4 (1.12 acres) were determined to be isolated. Wetland 1 was thoroughly investigated in the field and has no connection to WOUS. Drainage from wetland flows north and connects with wetlands behind school bus facility, but grade goes up towards Glenwood-Dyer Road to the north as well as towards the west and east. Water was visible standing in the field, up to a foot or so deep in spots. Water here does

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.
² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least “seasonally” (e.g., typically 3 months).
³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
not flow south, elevation slopes gradually up before sloping back towards the south, but water does not make it over that ridge by overland flow. Subsurface flow was not observed. Wetland 2 is connected to a drainage ditch that conveys water north towards Wetland 1. No surface or subsurface connections were observed between Wetland 2 and WOUS. Wetland 4 has no connection to WOUS. To be jurisdictional, water would flow towards the north. This area was investigated in the field but no solid flow routes from wetland 4 to the north were observed. It had recently rained and was raining on and off during the site visit. There are some ditches (small, shallow) in the farm field, but there was no defined route from wetland 4 to the north. There is more of a general slope in that direction, but no clear, defined connection. There are no known subsurface connections.
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; if the aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

1. TNW
   Identify TNW: Pick List.


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

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

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

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

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

If the waterbody4 is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

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

(i) General Area Conditions:
   Watershed size: 14076 acres
   Drainage area: Pick List
   Average annual rainfall: 36 inches
   Average annual snowfall: 38 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:
   (a) Relationship with TNW:
   ☑ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
   ☑ Tributary flows through 4 tributaries before entering TNW.

   Project waters are 10-15 river miles from TNW.
   Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.
   Project waters are 5-10 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
   Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
   Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

   Identify flow route to TNW5: Lansing Drainage Ditch continues north (conveying water from Wetlands 3, 5 and 6) to North Creek, which is Tributary to Thorn Creek, tributary to the Little Calumet River, ultimately to the Calumet River.

---

4 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

5 Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.
Tributary stream order, if known:  

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

**Tributary is:**  
- Natural  
- Artificial (man-made). Explain: Drainage has been significantly manipulated in the area. Wetland 3 drains through excavated ditches, some not listed as intermittent tributaries until near Lansing Drainage Ditch. Wetland 4 and 5 drain through what are likely excavated ditches a short distance north to the Lansing Drainage Ditch.  
- Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: May have been some natural drainage features, or simply expansive wetlands areas, connecting subject wetlands with RPWs.

**Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):**
- Average width: 5 feet  
- Average depth: 5 feet  
- Average side slopes: 2:1.

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

**Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Did not inspect intermittent tributaries in great detail. Ditches from wetland 3 were not seen in field, only in areals. Ditch from Wetlands 5 and 6 were observed.**
- Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:  
- Tributary geometry: Relatively straight  
- Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1%  

(c) Flow:
- **Tributary provides for:** Intermittent but not seasonal flow
- Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: 20 (or greater)
- Describe flow regime: likely flows fairly regularly in spring, but the entire area around the Lansing Drainage Ditch is quite flat, so drainage is likely slow. Wetlands appear to have been extensive around the Lansing drainage ditch, there are some large floodplain areas. A great deal of moisture is evident in areal photos in farm fields, particularly by Wetlands 5 and 6, with drain tiles visible in many years.  
- Other information on duration and volume:  
- Surface flow is: Discrete and confined. Characteristics:  
- Subsurface flow: Yes. Explain findings: drain tiles area present in the general area. Part of drainage from Wetland 3 is subsurface, but general flow route could be observed using aerals and 1 foot topo maps up to connection with the Lansing Drainage Ditch. There are likely drain tiles in the area around Wetlands 5 and 6 but none were observed.  
- Dye (or other) test performed:  

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

**If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):**
- **High Tide Line indicated by:**  
  - oil or scum line along shore objects  
  - fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)  
  - physical markings/characteristics  
  - tidal gauges  
  - other (list):  
- **Mean High Water Mark indicated by:**  
  - survey to available datum;  
  - physical markings;  
  - vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.

---

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

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

Explain: Little water was observed in the intermittent tributaries.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: .
(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):

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

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

- Properties:
  - Wetland size: Wetland 3 (0.88), Wetland 5 (0.32), Wetland 6 (4.17) acres
  - Wetland type. Explain: emergent.
  - Wetland quality. Explain: Low (Wetlands 3 and 5), moderate (Wetland 6) based on FQI.
  - Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

- Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: in spring flow may be continuous at times, otherwise intermittent.

  - Surface flow is: Discrete and confined
  - Characteristics: in channel (all) and diffuse (wetlands 5 and 6).

  - Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings: likely, see above.
    - Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

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

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:

- Project wetlands are 10-15 river miles from TNW.
- Project waters are 5-10 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
- Flow is from: Wetland to navigable waters.
- Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the 50 - 100-year floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

- Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: watershed has highly modified hydrology and is significantly disturbed by agricultural and other development. Water quality is likely poor due to disturbance and agriculture. Wetland with less effective drainage likely provide valuable flood storage and water quality benefits.
- Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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

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

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 3

Approximately ( 6.37 ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/ID</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: Wetlands provide valuable flood storage in the large floodplain area near wetlands 5 and 6 and naturally treat runoff from development and agriculture to improve downstream water quality. The natural areas provide refuge areas for species living in a fragmented and disturbed habitat.

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

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

2. Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D: The Lansing Drainage Ditch from this point goes south, then east, then back north across Glenwood Dyer Road. Flow continues north to the area near Wetlands 5 and 6. Wetlands 5 and 6 both drain north to the Lansing Drainage Ditch. From this point, the Lansing Drainage Ditch continues north (conveying water from Wetlands 3, 5 and 6) to North Creek, which is Tributary to Thorn Creek, tributary to the Little Calumet River, ultimately to the Calumet River.

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

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

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

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: .
Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:

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

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

   Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):
   - Tributary waters: 100 linear feet width (ft).
   - Other non-wetland waters: ______________ acres.
Identify type(s) of waters: ______________.

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

   Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow “seasonally.” Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:

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

5. **Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW** that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

6. **Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs** that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 6.37 acres.

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

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

   - which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
   - from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
   - which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
   - Interstate isolated waters. Explain: ______________.
   - Other factors. Explain: ______________.

---

8See Footnote # 3.
9To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
10Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.
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.
- Wetlands: ___ acres.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements.
- Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.
  - Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in “SWANCC,” the review area would have been regulated based solely on the “Migratory Bird Rule” (MBR).
- Waters do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: ___
- Other: (explain, if not covered above): ___

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all that apply):

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

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):

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

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: ___
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
- Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: ___
- Corps navigable waters’ study: ___
- USGS NHD data:
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps:
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List.
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google Maps.
  - 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: ___