

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): April 18, 2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District Corps, Reid-Anderson Boat Ramp, file #LRC02007-333

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: Lake County City: Lake Forest at Lake Michigan
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.263408 ° **N**, Long. -87.827846° **W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Lake Michigan

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Lake Michigan Watershed

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): April 18, 2007

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are** "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.

Explain: .

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

- TNWs, including territorial seas
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- Relatively permanent 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 0.15 acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Established by OHWM.**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): 581.5 Great Lake Datum (GLD).

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: .

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Lake Michigan**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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: **Pick List**
Drainage area: **Pick List**
Average annual rainfall: inches
Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: .
Tributary stream order, if known: .

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.

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

- Tributary is:** Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain:
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

- Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Explain: | | |

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain:

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: Pick List

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: Pick List

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: Pick List. Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:

- Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: | |

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
- 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: acres

Wetland type. Explain: .

Wetland quality. Explain: .

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain: .

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .

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 **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** 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: .

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: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres) Directly abuts? (Y/N) Size (in acres)

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

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: .
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-RPWs⁸ 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: 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: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

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):¹⁰

- 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: .

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.

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): **Leffler 9-19-2007**

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Melrose Park Culvert Repairs, LRC-2007-432

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 1600 North Avenue

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Melrose Park
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.907945°N, Long. -87.853517° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Silver 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: 9-19-2007
 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]

- 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.
Explain: Defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

- TNWs, including territorial seas
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
 Relatively permanent 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: 30 linear feet: 20 width (ft) and/or acres.
Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Established by OHWM.**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): unknown.

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: .

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Pick List**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: As defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

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: unknown acres
Drainage area: unknown **Pick List**
Average annual rainfall: 36.27 inches
Average annual snowfall: 38 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
 Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **1-2** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **1 (or less)** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Silver Creek drains southwest to the Des Plaines River.
Tributary stream order, if known:

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.

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

Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain:
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: 20 feet
Average depth: 5 feet
Average side slopes: **2:1**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

Silts Sands Concrete
 Cobbles Gravel Muck
 Bedrock Vegetation. Type/% cover:
 Other. Explain:

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: Eroding.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: No.

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): unknown %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Ephemeral flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20 (or greater)**

Describe flow regime: constant.

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Discrete**. Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings:

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (check all indicators that apply):
 clear, natural line impressed on the bank the presence of litter and debris
 changes in the character of soil destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 shelving the presence of wrack line
 vegetation matted down, bent, or absent sediment sorting
 leaf litter disturbed or washed away scour
 sediment deposition multiple observed or predicted flow events
 water staining abrupt change in plant community
 other (list):
 Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ 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: Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
 oil or scum line along shore objects survey to available datum;
 fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) physical markings;
 physical markings/characteristics vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
 tidal gauges
 other (list):

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: Water is of low quality consistent with urban streams.

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
- 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: acres

Wetland type. Explain: .

Wetland quality. Explain: .

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain: .

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .

- 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 **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** 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: .

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: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
----------------	------------------------------	------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

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: .
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-RPWs⁸ 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: 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: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

- 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):¹⁰

- 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: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

¹⁰ 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.

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.

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: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Pick List, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: River Forest 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- 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): .
or Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979)
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: .

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): Leffler, 9-19-2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Kennedy Pond Stabilization LRC-2007-433

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: East of Fox Lane, South of Mill Creek Lane

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Rolling Meadows

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.079105°N, Long. -88.054559° 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: 9-19-2007

Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Pick List** "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.

Explain: Defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Pick List** "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 1 acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Not established at this time.**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): unknown.

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: .

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Pick List**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: As defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

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: unknown **acres**
Drainage area: unknown **Pick List**
Average annual rainfall: 36.27 inches
Average annual snowfall: 38 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **30 (or more)** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **15-20** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Salt Creek drains in a meandering southeast direction into the Des Plaines River.
Tributary stream order, if known: unknown.

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.

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

Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain:
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: 15 feet
Average depth: 5 feet
Average side slopes: **3:1**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

Silts Sands Concrete
 Cobbles Gravel Muck
 Bedrock Vegetation. Type/% cover:
 Other. Explain:

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: moderately eroding.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: yes, minimal.

Tributary geometry: **Meandering**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): unknown %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Ephemeral flow**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **20 (or greater)**

Describe flow regime: constant.

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Discrete**. Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings:

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (check all indicators that apply):
 clear, natural line impressed on the bank the presence of litter and debris
 changes in the character of soil destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 shelving the presence of wrack line
 vegetation matted down, bent, or absent sediment sorting
 leaf litter disturbed or washed away scour
 sediment deposition multiple observed or predicted flow events
 water staining abrupt change in plant community
 other (list):
 Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ 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: Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
 oil or scum line along shore objects survey to available datum;
 fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) physical markings;
 physical markings/characteristics vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
 tidal gauges
 other (list):

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: Tributary has a high sediment load and likely poor water quality consistent with an urban stream.

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
- 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: acres

Wetland type. Explain: .

Wetland quality. Explain: .

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain: .

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .

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 **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** 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: .

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: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
----------------	------------------------------	------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

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: .
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: Salt Creek is a blue-line stream on the 1993 topographic Palatine map .
 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: **500** linear feet **200** width (ft).
 - Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: .

3. Non-RPWs⁸ 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: 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: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

- 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):¹⁰

- 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: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

¹⁰ 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.

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.

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: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Pick List, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palatine 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- 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 Earth as accessed on 9-19-2007.
or Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979)
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: .

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): 9/12/2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2007-444

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 996 Woodcliff Dr.

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Unincorporated South Elgin
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.98177°N, Long. 88.295675° 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): **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:

Field Determination. Date(s): 8/21/2007

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are no** "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]

Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.

Explain: Defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

TNWs, including territorial seas

Wetlands adjacent to TNWs

Relatively permanent 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: 43 linear feet: width (ft) and/or 0.04 acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM.

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: .

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Pick List**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: As defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

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: **acres**
Drainage area: **acres**
Average annual rainfall: inches
Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵:
Tributary stream order, if known:

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.

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

- Tributary is:** Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: _____
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: _____

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: _____ feet
Average depth: _____ feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Explain: _____ | | |

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: _____

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: _____

Tributary geometry: **Pick List**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): _____ %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime: _____

Other information on duration and volume: _____

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. Characteristics: _____

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: _____

Dye (or other) test performed: _____

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: _____ | |

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): _____ | |

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: _____

Identify specific pollutants, if known: _____

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
- 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: acres

Wetland type. Explain: .

Wetland quality. Explain: .

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain: .

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .

- 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 **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** 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: .

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: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
----------------	------------------------------	------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

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: .
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: Water was present during site visit, storm sewers and culverts carry flow under roads.
 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: **43** linear feet <**5** width (ft).
 - Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: .

3. Non-RPWs⁸ 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: 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: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

- 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):¹⁰

- 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: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

¹⁰ 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.

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.

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: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: Geneva HA 142, 1965, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Geneva 7.5", 1993, Geneva 15", 1948, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Geneva, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2001, 2005, 5006.
 - or Other (Name & Date): Site Visit Photos 8/21/2007.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979)
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Stream flows east directly to the Fox River, the headwaters are west of the property off off Woodridge Circle.

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): 9/4/07

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2007-566

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **McHenry** City: Wonder Lake
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.3749734147119 °N, Long. -88.3606059654674° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Wonder Lake

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Upper Fox (07120006)**

- Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.
 Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc...) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

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

- Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 9/4/07
 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]

- 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.
Explain: Defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

- TNWs, including territorial seas
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
 Relatively permanent 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 830 acres.
Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Pick List**

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: .

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Pick List**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: As defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

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: **Pick List**
Drainage area: **Pick List**
Average annual rainfall: inches
Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵:
Tributary stream order, if known:

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.

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

- Tributary is:** Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: _____
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: _____

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: _____ feet
Average depth: _____ feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Explain: _____ | | |

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: _____

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: _____

Tributary geometry: **Pick List**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): _____ %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime: _____

Other information on duration and volume: _____

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. Characteristics: _____

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: _____

Dye (or other) test performed: _____

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: _____ | |

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): _____ | |

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: _____

Identify specific pollutants, if known: _____

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
- 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: acres

Wetland type. Explain: .

Wetland quality. Explain: .

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain: .

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .

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 **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** 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: .

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: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
----------------	------------------------------	------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

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: .
- 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: Wonder Lake is an 830 Acre man-made lake. It flows to the Fox River via Nippersink Creek.
 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-RPWs⁸ 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: 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: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

- 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):¹⁰

- 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: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

¹⁰ 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.

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.

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: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:Richmond HA 303, 1969, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Richmond 7.5", 1992, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Richmond, .
- 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): .
or Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979)
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Wonder Lake is an 830 Acre man-made lake, which drains to the Fox River (a navigable waterway) via the Nippersink Creek.

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): 8/23/2007

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2006-1218, Jet-Brite Carwash

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: East of Farnsworth Ave, North of Reckinger Rd

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Aurora

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.787173°N, Long. 88.280786° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Indian 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: 11/29/2006

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]

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.

Explain: Defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

TNWs, including territorial seas

Wetlands adjacent to TNWs

Relatively permanent 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: 0.6 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:

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.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Pick List**.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: As defined in People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, slip op. at 7 (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979).

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: **Pick List**
Drainage area: **Pick List**
Average annual rainfall: inches
Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵:
Tributary stream order, if known:

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.

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

- Tributary is:** Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: _____
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: _____

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

Average width: _____ feet
Average depth: _____ feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Explain: _____ | | |

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: _____

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: _____

Tributary geometry: **Pick List**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): _____ %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime: _____

Other information on duration and volume: _____

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. Characteristics: _____

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: _____

Dye (or other) test performed: _____

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: _____ | |

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): _____ | |

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: _____

Identify specific pollutants, if known: _____

⁶A 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.

⁷Ibid.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
- 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: acres

Wetland type. Explain: .

Wetland quality. Explain: .

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain: .

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings: .

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 **Pick List** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** 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: .

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: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Name/ID</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
----------------	------------------------------	------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

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: .
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: Indian Creek is a perennial stream.
- 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-RPWs⁸ 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: 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: **The wetland is part of a 13 acres wetland that directly abuts Indian Creek. It is part of the ADID wetland complex of #3316 and #3305.**
 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: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

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):¹⁰

- 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: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

¹⁰ 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.

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.

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: Wetland Delineation dated 10/17/2006.
- 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: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: Pick List, .
- 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): 2002, 2005.
 - or Other (Name & Date): 3/14/2006 Consultant Site Photos.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: People of State of Ill. ex rel. Scott v. Hoffman, No. P-CIV-76-45, (S.D.Ill. Jan. 20, 1979)
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Wetland drains north to Indian Creek, which flows south and west to the Fox River, a navigable waterway and is therefore subject to Department of the Army regulations.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Bruti Associates
Frankfort, Will County, Illinois
FILE NUMBER: LRC-2006-571

PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: St Francis Road and Walnut Creek Drive in
PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [X] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: FRANKFORT.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: FRANKFORT, 231.
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Topographic Maps:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15-Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[X] Aerials (Name & Date): Frankfort, 1997
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps:
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The wetland on the subject property drains into an intermittent tributary that flows to Union Drainage Ditch. Union Drainage Ditch discharges into Hickory Creek and then into the Des Plaines River, a navigable waters of the U.S.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

- Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
[] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[] changes in the character of soil
[] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated , prepared by .
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: [Signature] Date: 5 Sep 07

Approved by: [Signature] Date: 6 Sep 07

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

² Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: IMTT-Channahon PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: South side of the Des Plaines River near River Mile 276.8 in Channahon, Will County, Illinois

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-120 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[X] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [X] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: CHANNAHON.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: CHANNAHON, 362.
[] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Topographic Maps:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15-Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[X] Aerials (Name & Date): Channahon, 1997
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps:
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The Des Plaines River is a navigable waters of the U.S.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- [] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[] changes in the character of soil
[] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated , prepared by .
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: [Signature] Date: 5 Sep 07

Approved by: [Signature] Date: 5 Sep 07

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Company PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Bridge 136 over Addison Creek in Broadview, Cook County, Illinois (Section 21, T39N, R12E)

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-254 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[X] Aerials (Name & Date): Google Earth, accessed on August 24, 2007
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Addison Creek flows directly to the Des Plaines River, a navigable water.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

- Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
[X] clear, natural line impressed on the bank [] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] the presence of litter and debris [] shelving
[] changes in the character of soil [] other:
[] wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [X] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated May 2006, prepared by Bollinger, Lach & Associates.
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____ Date: _____

Approved by: -5- Date: 9/6/07

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Abbott Laboratories PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: North Chicago at Lake Michigan, Cook County, Illinois

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2006-1324 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [] Office [X] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[X] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [X] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: HIGHLAND PARK.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: HIGHLAND PARK, HA 69.
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: HIGHLAND PARK, 1993.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] Aerials (Name & Date):
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps:
[] Site Visit Conducted on: February 22, 2007
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above):

Project is located on Lake Michigan, a navigable waterway.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

- Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
[X] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[] changes in the character of soil
[] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [X] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated December 4, 2006, prepared by EOR.
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: [Signature] Date: 9/1/07

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Round Lake Area Park District PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Fairfield Road North of Long Lake Road in Round Lake Beach, Lake County, Illinois

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-364 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[X] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [X] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: GRAYSLAKE.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: GRAYSLAKE, HA 230.
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: GRAYSLAKE, 1993.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] Aerials (Name & Date):
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps:
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The wetland, excvated drainage channel and Round Lake Drain are under the jurisdiction of this office due to a hydrologic connection to Squaw Creek, which drains into a navigable waterway called the Des Plaines River.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- [X] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[X] changes in the character of soil
[X] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated March 8, 2007, prepared by LCSMC.
[X] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: [Signature] Date: 30 Aug. 2007

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: DuPage County Department of Engineering Division of Stormwater and Environmental Concerns

PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Kress Creek South of Hawthorn Lane, North of Illinois Route 38 and East of Kress Road in the City of West Chicago, DuPage County, Illinois

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2006-1181 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[X] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [X] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: WEST CHICAGO.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: WEST CHICAGO, HA 202.
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for DuPage County.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: WEST CHICAGO, 1993.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] Aerial Photographs (Name & Date):
[X] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: DUPAGE COUNTY..
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[X] Other information: Submittal dated September 25, 2006

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Kress Creek is a jurisdictional waters of the U.S. that flows to the West Branch DuPage River , DuPage River to the Des Plaines River which is a section 10 waters of the U.S.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- [] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[] changes in the character of soil
[] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated , prepared by .
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: [Signature] Date: 9-6-2007

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Forest Preserve District of Cook County PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: 4800 S. Harlem Avenue in Lyons, Cook County, Illinois (Section 1, T38N, R12E)

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-152 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[X] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____
[] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] Aerials (Name & Date): _____
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____
[] Site Visit Conducted on: _____
[X] Other information: Wetland Investigation Report dated June 2007, prepared by Huff & Huff, Inc.

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Wetlands 1, 2, 3 and 4, as identified in your delineation report, are adjacent to an unnamed tributary to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, a navigable water.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

- Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
[] clear, natural line impressed on the bank [] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] the presence of litter and debris [] shelving
[] changes in the character of soil [] other:
[X] wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [X] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated June 2007, prepared by Huff & Huff, Inc.
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____ Date: 9/10/07

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Naperville Park District PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Spring Brook Golf Course in Naperville, DuPage County, Illinois / Spring Brook Tributary No. 2

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-269 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: NORMANTOWN.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: NORMANTOWN, HA 210.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for DuPage County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: NORMANTOWN, 1993.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerial Photographs (Name & Date): _____.
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: DUPAGE COUNTY..
- Site Visit Conducted on: _____.
- Other information: March 6, 2007 DuPage County Wetland Submittal prepared by Atwell-Hicks Development Consultants.

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The subject wetlands, and the in-line ponds, are adjacent and contiguous with Spring Brook Tributary No. 2; which flows into Spring Brook Creek, then West Branch DuPage River, the DuPage River, and finally the Des Plaines River, a navigable in-fact waterway below the Hoffman Dam in Riverside, Illinois.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated _____, prepared by _____.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____ Date: 07 SEPT 07

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Forest Preserve District of Cook County PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Near 1900 W. Tower Road In Northfield, Cook County, Illinois (Section 12 & 13, T42N, R12E and Section 19, T42N, R12E)

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-410

PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____
[] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: EVANSTON, 1993.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] Aerials (Name & Date):
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above):

Skokie Lagoons drain to the Chicago River, a navigable water.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- [X] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[] changes in the character of soil
[X] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [X] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated September 2000, prepared by Harza Engineering Company.
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: [Signature] Date: 9/10/07

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Village of Homer Glen PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Bruce Road and Heritage Drive
Near New Lenox, Will County, Illinois
FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-172 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: MOKENA.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: MOKENA, 204.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Topographic Maps: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerials (Name & Date): Homer Glen, 1997
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____.
- Site Visit Conducted on: _____.
- Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): the unnamed tributary drains into Spring Creek which then flows into the Des Plaines River, a navigable waters of the U.S.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated _____, prepared by _____.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: _____ Date: 10 Sep 07

Approved by: _____ Date: 10 SEP 07

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

² Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Village of Glendale Heights PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Reskin Park Located South of Polo Club Drive and North of Winthrop Avenue in the Village of Glendale Heights, DuPage County, Illinois/Armitage Creek

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-419 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [X] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: LOMBARD.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: LOMBARD, HA 143.
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for DuPage County.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: LOMBARD, 1993.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles:
[X] Aerial Photographs (Name & Date):2001
[X] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: DUPAGE COUNTY..
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[X] Other information: Waters of the U.S. Assessment Dated December 9, 2005 prepared by CBBEL

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Armitage Creek which is a tributary to the East Branch DuPage River which flows to the Des Plaines River with is a navigable waters of the U.S.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- [] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[] changes in the character of soil
[] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated , prepared by .
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: [Signature] Date: 8-13-07

Approved by: Date:

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Southwest Comprehensive Oncology Center PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: 5 Acre AlphaMed Medical Complex Property Located Northeast of IL Route 45 and 175th Street in Tinley Park, Cook County, Illinois (Section 27, T36N, R12E)

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-56 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerials (Name & Date): Google Earth as accessed on September 12, 2007
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____.
- Site Visit Conducted on: Spring 2007
- Other information: Applicant's submittal

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above):

Skokie Lagoons drain to the Chicago River, a navigable water.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated February 16, 2006, prepared by JFNew.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____

-5

Date: 9/12/07

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

² Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Gewalt Hamilton Assoc. PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: North Branch/Deerfield

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2006-1004 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: HIGHLAND PARK, 1993.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerials (Name & Date): Lake County 1939, 2000, 2004, & 2005; PhotoMapper 2001, 2002 & 2005
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: LAKE COUNTY.
- Site Visit Conducted on:
- Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The wetlands on site are tributary to the North Branch of the Chicago River. The North Branch is a navigable water of the United States therefore all of its tributary waters are also waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated October 31, 2006, prepared by Christopher B Burke Engineering, Ltd.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: _____ **ORIGINAL SIGNED** _____ Date: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: **SEP 18 2007**

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

² Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: JBB Illinois Real Estate Holdings, Inc. PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: South of Illinois Route 6, East of Youngs Road and North of the Des Plaines River in Joliet, Will County, Illinois

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-1 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [] Office [X] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[X] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[X] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[X] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [X] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: CHANNAHON.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: CHANNAHON, 362.
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Topographic Maps: _____.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
[X] Aerials (Name & Date): J oliet, 1997
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____.
[X] Site Visit Conducted on: July 12, 2007
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Area 1 includes wetland areas, Rock Run Creek and the Des Plaines River. The Des Plaines River is a navigable waters of the U.S.; therefore, Area 1 is jurisdictional. Areas 2-7 are wetlands that are isolated and therefore not jurisdictional. Area 8 is an upland area and is therefore not jurisdictional.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

- Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
[] clear, natural line impressed on the bank [] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] the presence of litter and debris [] shelving
[] changes in the character of soil [] other:
[] wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [X] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated June 13, 2007, prepared by V3 Consultants.
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: _____ Date: 12 Sep 07

Approved by: _____ Date: 19 Sep 07

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

**INFORMATION SHEET
 DETERMINATIONS OF NO JURISDICTION FOR ISOLATED, NON-NAVIGABLE, INTRA-STATE WATERS
 RESULTING FROM U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION IN SOLID WASTE AGENCY OF NORTHERN COOK
 COUNTY V. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

DISTRICT OFFICE: Chicago
FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-1

REGULATORY PROJECT MANAGER: Melyssa Navis **Date:** 12 Sep 2007

PROJECT REVIEW/DETERMINATION COMPLETED: **In the office** (Y/N) **Date:**
At the project site (Y/N) **Date:** July 12, 2007

PROJECT LOCATION INFORMATION:

State: Illinois
County: Will
Center coordinates of site by latitude & longitudinal coordinates: 41.48 & -88.15
Approximate size of site/property (including uplands & in acres):
Name of waterway or watershed:

SITE CONDITIONS:

Type of aquatic resource ¹	0-1 ac	1-3 ac	3-5 ac	5-10 ac	10-25 ac	25-50 ac	> 50 ac	Linear feet	Unknown
Lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
River	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Dry Wash	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Mudflat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Sandflat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Slough	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Prairie pothole	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wet meadow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Playa lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Vernal pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural pond	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other water (identify type)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe type of isolated, non-navigable, intra-state water present and best estimate for size of non-jurisdictional aquatic resource area.

Migratory Bird Rule Factors ¹ :	If Known		If Unknown Use Best Professional Judgment		
	Yes	No	Predicted to Occur	Not Expected to Occur	Not Able To Make Determination
Is or would be used as habitat for birds protected by Migratory Bird Treaties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is or would be used as habitat by other migratory birds that cross state lines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is or would be used as habitat for endangered species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is used to irrigate crops sold in interstate commerce?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe potential for applicability of the Migratory Bird Rule to apply to onsite, non-jurisdictional, isolated, non-navigable, intra-state aquatic resource area.

TYPE OF DETERMINATION: Preliminary Or Approved

OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING NJD (e.g., paragraph 1 – site conditions; paragraphs 2-3 – rationale used to determine NJD, including information reviewed to assess potential navigation or interstate commerce connections; and paragraph 4 – site information on waters of the U.S. occurring onsite):

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Colony Builders
Tyler in Joliet, Will County, Illinois

PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: 3800 Caton Farm Road, East of I-55, North of

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-285

PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: JOLIET.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: JOLIET, 89.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Topographic Maps: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerials (Name & Date): Joliet, 1997
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____.
- Site Visit Conducted on:
- Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Area 1 & Area 3 are adjacent to Area 2. Area 2 is an unnamed tributary to the DuPage River. The DuPage River flows into the Des Plaines River, a navigable waters of the U.S. Therefore, Areas 1-3 are jurisdictional due to their hydrologic connection to the Des Plaines River. Area 4 & Area 5 are isolated and therefore not jurisdictional.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

- Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
 - the presence of litter and debris
 - changes in the character of soil
 - wetland boundary
 - destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 - shelving
 - other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated _____, prepared by _____.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: _____ Date: 11 Sep 07

Approved by: _____ Date: 17 Sep 07

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

**INFORMATION SHEET
 DETERMINATIONS OF NO JURISDICTION FOR ISOLATED, NON-NAVIGABLE, INTRA-STATE WATERS
 RESULTING FROM U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION IN SOLID WASTE AGENCY OF NORTHERN COOK
 COUNTY V. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

DISTRICT OFFICE: Chicago
FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-285

REGULATORY PROJECT MANAGER: Melyssa Navis **Date:** 11 Sep 2007

PROJECT REVIEW/DETERMINATION COMPLETED: **In the office** Y (Y/N) **Date:** 11 Sep 2007
At the project site (Y/N) **Date:**

PROJECT LOCATION INFORMATION:

State: Illinois
County: Will
Center coordinates of site by latitude & longitudinal coordinates: 41.56 & -88.17
Approximate size of site/property (including uplands & in acres):
Name of waterway or watershed:

SITE CONDITIONS:

Type of aquatic resource ¹	0-1 ac	1-3 ac	3-5 ac	5-10 ac	10-25 ac	25-50 ac	> 50 ac	Linear feet	Unknown
Lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
River	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Dry Wash	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Mudflat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Sandflat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>				
Slough	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Prairie pothole	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wet meadow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Playa lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Vernal pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural pond	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other water (identify type)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe type of isolated, non-navigable, intra-state water present and best estimate for size of non-jurisdictional aquatic resource area.

Migratory Bird Rule Factors ¹ :	If Known		If Unknown Use Best Professional Judgment		
	Yes	No	Predicted to Occur	Not Expected to Occur	Not Able To Make Determination
Is or would be used as habitat for birds protected by Migratory Bird Treaties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is or would be used as habitat by other migratory birds that cross state lines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is or would be used as habitat for endangered species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is used to irrigate crops sold in interstate commerce?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe potential for applicability of the Migratory Bird Rule to apply to onsite, non-jurisdictional, isolated, non-navigable, intra-state aquatic resource area.

TYPE OF DETERMINATION: Preliminary Or Approved

OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING NJD (e.g., paragraph 1 – site conditions; paragraphs 2-3 – rationale used to determine NJD, including information reviewed to assess potential navigation or interstate commerce connections; and paragraph 4 – site information on waters of the U.S. occurring onsite):

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Iain Smith

PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Flint Creek/North Barrington

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2006-1132

PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: BARRINGTON, 1993.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerials (Name & Date): Lake County 1939, 2000, 2004, & 2005; PhotoMapper 2001, 2002 & 2005
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: LAKE COUNTY.
- Site Visit Conducted on:
- Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The pond is tributary to the Fox River via honey Lake and Flint Creek. The Fox River is a navigable water of the United States, and therefore its tributaries are also waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- the presence of litter and debris
- shelving
- changes in the character of soil
- other
- wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated _____, prepared by _____.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: _____ Date: 9/19/07

Approved by: ORIGINAL SIGNED _____ Date: _____

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

²Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Fox River Water Reclamation District PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Kane County

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-261 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: ELGIN.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Kane County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: ELGIN, 1992.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerial Photographs (Name & Date):2005
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: KANE COUNTY
- Site Visit Conducted on: 11/28/2007
- Other information: FEMA FIRM map

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Wetland A directly abuts the Fox River. Wetland B is an unnamed tributary to the Fox River. Wetland C is part of a wetland complex that flows south through an unnamed tributary to the Fox River. The Fox River is a navigable waterway.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soils
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated December 2006 , prepared by Baxter & Woodman.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____ S _____ Date: 9-20-2007

Approved by: _____ 5 _____ Date: 9-21-2007

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

² Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: City of Lockport PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Adams Street Between Grandview Avenue and Milne Drive in Lockport, Will County, Illinois

FILE NUMBER: PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: JOLIET.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: JOLIET, 89.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Will County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Topographic Maps: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15-Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerials (Name & Date): Lockport, 1997
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____.
- Site Visit Conducted on:
- Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Milne Creek drains into the Des Plaines River a navigable waters of the U.S. and is therefore jurisdictional.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated _____, prepared by _____.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: _____ Date: 24 Sep 07

Approved by: _____ Date: 25 Sep 07

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

² Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Forest Preserve District of Cook County PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: John J. Duffy Forest Preserve in Palos Park, Cook County, Illinois (Sections 20 and 21, T37N, R12E)

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-414 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____
[] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: PALOS PARK, 1993.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] Aerials (Name & Date):
[] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): Tributaries onsite drain directly to the Calumet Sag Channel, a navigable water.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- [X] clear, natural line impressed on the bank [X] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] the presence of litter and debris [X] shelving
[] changes in the character of soil [] other:
[] wetland boundary

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated _____, prepared by _____
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____ Date: 9/27/07

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: Guy Lolmaugh PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Fish Lake Drain/Volo

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-150 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: [X] Office [] Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- [] There are no waters on the project site.
[] There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
[X] There are waters of the United States on the project site.
[] There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- [] There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
[] The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
[] The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands^1). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
[X] The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
[] The presence of wetlands adjacent^2 (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
[] The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
[] Other:
[] Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- [] U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____
[X] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Lake County.
[X] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: ZION, 1993.
[] U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[] U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____
[X] Aerials (Name & Date):Lake County 1939, 2000, 2004, & 2005; PhotoMapper 2001, 2002 & 2005
[X] Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: LAKE COUNTY.
[] Site Visit Conducted on:
[] Other information:

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above): The wetland has a surface water connection to Lake Michigan, a navigable water of the United States, via the Waukegan River. Therefore the wetland is also a water of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- [] clear, natural line impressed on the bank
[] the presence of litter and debris
[] changes in the character of soil
[X] wetland boundary
[] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
[] shelving
[] other

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- [] Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
[] Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Area under consideration is not likely have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
[] Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- [X] This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated October 22, 2006, prepared by DK Environmental Services.
[] This office does not confirm your wetland boundary

Recommended by: _____ Date: 9/28/07

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

^1Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology). Processes for determining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

^2 Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION DECISION DOCUMENT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District

APPLICANT: AMCOL International Corporation PROJECT LOCATION/WATERWAY: Southwest of Higgins Road And Forbs Avenue In Hoffman Estates, Cook County, Illinois (Section 32 & 33, T42N, R9E)

FILE NUMBER: LRC-2007-145 PROJECT REVIEW COMPLETED: Office Field

Approved Jurisdictional Determination (JD) (For Sites regulated under 33 CFR 320-330). An approved JD is an appealable action. (33 CFR 331.2)

Based on available information:

- There are no waters on the project site.
- There are non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.
- There are waters of the United States on the project site.
- There are both waters of the United States and non-jurisdictional waters on the project site.

Basis of Jurisdictional Determination:

- There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present on the project site.
- The presence of waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide (i.e., navigable waters of the U.S.) (33 CFR 328.3(a)(1))
- The presence of interstate waters (including interstate wetlands¹). (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(2))
- The presence of a tributary to an interstate water or other water of the US. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(5))
- The presence of wetlands adjacent² (bordering, contiguous, or neighboring) to interstate or other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands. (33 CFR 328.3 (a)(7))
- The presence of an isolated water (e.g., intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds).
- Other:
- Section 10 waterway.

Information Reviewed

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: _____.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Cook County.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps: EVANSTON, 1993.
- U. S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- U. S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic Quadrangles: _____.
- Aerials (Name & Date): _____.
- Advanced Identification Wetland Maps: _____.
- Site Visit Conducted on: April 20, 2007
- Other information: Applicant's submittal

Rationale for Basis (applies to any boxes checked above):

Skokie Lagoons drain to the Chicago River, a navigable water.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction (33 CFR 328 and 329):

Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:

- clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- the presence of litter and debris
- changes in the character of soil
- wetland boundary
- destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- shelving
- other:

Basis for Declining Jurisdiction:

- Unable to confirm the presence of waters listed in 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1), 328.3(a)(2), or 328.3(a)(4) through 328.3(a)(7)
 - Area under consideration is likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
 - Area under consideration is not likely to have been jurisdictional under pre-SWANCC Migratory Bird Rule criteria
- Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 328.3(a)(3) [attach copy of HQ rationale]

Confirmation of Wetland Boundaries

- This office concurs with your wetland delineation report dated September 2000, prepared by Harza Engineering Company.
- This office does not confirm your wetland boundary.

Recommended by: _____

Date: _____

Approved by: _____

Date: _____

¹Wetlands are identified and del occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and
from methods described in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (1987).

Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e.,
etermining wetlands on agricultural lands may vary

² Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

**INFORMATION SHEET
 DETERMINATIONS OF NO JURISDICTION FOR ISOLATED, NON-NAVIGABLE, INTRA-STATE WATERS
 RESULTING FROM U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION IN SOLID WASTE AGENCY OF NORTHERN COOK
 COUNTY V. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

DISTRICT OFFICE: Chicago
 FILE NUMBER:

REGULATORY PROJECT MANAGER: Paul Leffler Date: September 12, 2007

PROJECT REVIEW/DETERMINATION COMPLETED: In the office (Y/N) Date: September 12, 2007
 At the project site (Y/N) Date:

PROJECT LOCATION INFORMATION:

State: Illinois
 County: Cook
 Center coordinates of site by latitude & longitudinal coordinates: 42.076918 -88.200455
 Approximate size of site/property (including uplands & in acres): 10
 Name of waterway or watershed: Fox River/Poplar Creek

SITE CONDITIONS:

Type of aquatic resource ¹	0-1 ac	1-3 ac	3-5 ac	5-10 ac	10-25 ac	25-50 ac	> 50 ac	Linear feet	Unknown
Lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
River	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Dry Wash	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Mudflat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Sandflat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Slough	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Prairie pothole	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wet meadow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Playa lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Vernal pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural pond	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other water (identify type)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe type of isolated, non-navigable, intra-state water present and best estimate for size of non-jurisdictional aquatic resource area.

Migratory Bird Rule Factors ¹ :	If Known		If Unknown Use Best Professional Judgment		
	Yes	No	Predicted to Occur	Not Expected to Occur	Not Able To Make Determination
Is or would be used as habitat for birds protected by Migratory Bird Treaties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is or would be used as habitat by other migratory birds that cross state lines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is or would be used as habitat for endangered species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is used to irrigate crops sold in interstate commerce?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe potential for applicability of the Migratory Bird Rule to apply to onsite, non-jurisdictional, isolated, non-navigable, intra-state aquatic resource area.

TYPE OF DETERMINATION: Preliminary Or Approved

OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING NJD (e.g., paragraph 1 – site conditions; paragraphs 2-3 – rationale used to determine NJD, including information reviewed to assess potential navigation or interstate commerce connections; and paragraph 4 – site information on waters of the U.S. occurring onsite):