

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): January 10, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Village of Oak Lawn, LRC-2016-774

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Bike Path West of Harlem Ave. from 121st to 151st Street
State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Palos Park
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.63343°N, Long. -87.79994° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Tinley Creek

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

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

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

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

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: December 15, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): December 9, 2016

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: 50 linear feet: 1 width (ft) and/or 0.02 acres.

Wetlands: 2.46 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

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: 462669 acres
Drainage area: 10292 acres
Average annual rainfall: 38.37 inches
Average annual snowfall: 42.6 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW.

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

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Several tributaries flow directly into Tinley Creek, which is a direct tributary of the Calumet-Sag Channel. A few tributaries flow directly into Navajo Creek, which ties into Tinley Creek.

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

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

Tributary stream order, if known: Tertiary.

(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: 1 feet
Average depth: 0.5 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 ravine-like tributaries of Tinley Creek are clustered in the Forest Preserve property in a dense pattern of natural drainage features in a topographically diverse landscape. Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: Absent due to steepness.

Tributary geometry: **Meandering**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1-5 %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Intermittent but not seasonal flow**

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

Describe flow regime: These tributaries had flow in them at the time of my visit due to snow melt, and based on conditions, will flow after rain events as well.

Other information on duration and volume: Flow appears to be a combination of surface and sub-surface fed.

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**. Characteristics: Ravine-like rivulets running together into Tinley Creek.

Subsurface flow: **Yes**. Explain findings: Some channels started on the surface, then disappeared for a short distance, and then re-appeared on the surface again with even stronger flow before going into the RPW.

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 was clear in all the small tributaries.

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: 2.46 acres

Wetland type. Explain: All wetlands were emergent.

Wetland quality. Explain: Moderate.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Intermittent flow**. Explain: Water flows out of wetland into small tributaries after any significant rain event or snow melt.

Surface flow is: **Overland sheetflow**

Characteristics: Most wetlands are on a slope, and sheet flow downslope until forming a small tributary.

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. 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 **2-5** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **1-2** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Wetland to navigable waters**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **50 - 100-year** floodplain.

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: Water is clear as these are mostly in a forest preserve system.

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: **8**

Approximately (2.46) 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>
Site 2	Y	0.3	Site 3	Y	0.01
Site 4	Y	0.13	Site 7	Y	1.0
Site 8	Y	0.54	Site 12	Y	0.43
Site 19	Y	0.05	Site 23	Y	0.15

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: Sites 2, 3, 4, 7 & 8 are all wetlands formed from a combination of surface and ground water due to their locations in the Tinley Creek watershed within the Palos Forest Preserve District lands which are natural and undisturbed. Site 12 drains into Turtlehead Lake, and then into Tinley Creek. These wetlands are part of the natural landscape, and are intermixed with woodlands and prairies; and as such, provide habitat for birds, mammals and amphibians. These wetlands are adjacent and contiguous to the tributary network to Tinley Creek, which has relative permanent flow, and exhibits a surface water connection to a traditional navigable waterway. Site 19 appears to be a seep area with standing water and cattails, and outlets via a small channel into an 8" pipe that goes to Navajo Creek about 100 yards to the south. This wetland serves to filter out pollutants from the surrounding urban setting before draining into Navajo Creek. Site 23 sheet flows to the NE before running out via a small channel into a Storm Sewer that drains to Navajo Creek. Navajo Creek drains into Tinley Creek, which is a tributary of the Calumet-Sag Channel. The headwater wetlands are receiving a percentage of their water from groundwater and from runoff from the surrounding uplands before it flows into Calumet-Sag Channel. Wetlands such as these provide stormwater storage, habitat, sediment/toxicant retention and nutrient removal/transformation. The decrease of sedimentation, pollutants, flooding, nutrients and habitat provided by the subject wetlands provides a positive effect to the downstream relatively permanent waters and traditional navigable waters. This surface water connection demonstrates the ability of the headwater wetlands and the tributary network to decrease pollutants, flood waters, nutrients and organic carbon reaching the TNW.

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: These wetlands in combination with other area wetlands, significantly affect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Calumet-Sag Channel. Stormwater storage provided by the subject wetlands affect the frequency and extent of downstream flooding, decreasing flood peaks in the Calumet-Sag Channel, and in turn impacting navigation and downstream bank erosion and sedimentation. The sediment and pollutant/toxicant retention provided by the subject wetlands has a direct positive effect on the Calumet-Sag Channel in regards to navigation and aquatic food webs that are not adapted to thrive in sediment-choked environments. These factors contribute to the finding of a significant nexus between the on-site wetland and the TNW.

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: **50** linear feet **1** 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: **2.46** acres.

7. **Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹**

As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

- 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: _____.

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: Huff & Huff, Inc. Wetland and Waters of the U.S. Investigation Report dated September 2016.
- 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: Palos Park HA 145, 1966, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palos Park 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Palos Park, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 1999-2016 Google Earth.
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: Site visit on December 9, 2016 where flow was observed at the time connecting all the subject wetlands to either Tinley Creek via a network of tributaries, or to Navajo Creek via a pipe. Channels were distinct, and had evidence of multiple flow events each year.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): January 19, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Village of Oak Lawn, LRC-2016-774

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Bike Path West of Harlem Ave. from 121st to 151st Street

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Palos Park
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.63343°N, Long. -87.79994° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Tinley Creek

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

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

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

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

- Office (Desk) Determination. Date: December 15, 2016
 Field Determination. Date(s): December 9, 2016

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
 Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or 0.17 acres.
Wetlands: 4.10 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: Site 6 WOUS is Tinley Creek, which is mapped as a blue-line stream on the USGS Maps. Site 16 WOUS is a well defined tributary that has year-round flow, and the bike path has a bridge over it. Site 17 WOUS is Navajo Creek, which is mapped as a blue-line stream on the USGS Maps. Site 22 WOUS shows water flow in multiple aerials over the past 15 years, and is fed from far off-site to the west, and had strong flow during my visit.
 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: **300** linear feet **15** 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: **Site 6 Wetland extends from both sides of Tinley Creek without separation from the creek. Site 14 wetland drains north via a culvert into a tributary that has continual flow throughout the year as evidenced on last 5 years of aerials, and flow observed during site visit. Sites 15 & 16 both abut Site 16 WOUS which has RPW flow. Site 17 Wetland extends to both sides of Site 17 WOUS (Navajo Creek), which has RPW flow. Site 22 Wetland is on both sides of Site 22 WOUS without separation. RD5 Wetland drains directly into Site 22 WOUS where it drops into a concrete box.**
 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: **4.08** 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: Huff & Huff, Inc. Wetland and Waters of the U.S. Investigation Report dated September 2016.
 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: Palos Park HA 145, 1966,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palos Park 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Palos Park,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List,
 FEMA/FIRM maps:
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 1999-2016 Google Earth.
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: Site visit on December 9, 2016 to observe RPW flow in all 5 waterways; and verify that the subject wetlands directly abut these RPW waterways.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 23, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2016-857, ANR Wisc. S. Expansion

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: West of Ketchum Road, North and South of Allen Rd

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Hampshire Township
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.10855°N, Long. -88.49484° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Tributary to Hampshire Creek

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

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

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

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

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 12/27/2016

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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 0.52 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: .
 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: .

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: **0.52** 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, plats or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Delineation dated 8/24/2016.
 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: Pingree Grove 7.5", 1992, Pick List, Pick List, .
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pingree Grove, .
 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): .
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: Wetland 1 is about 0.52 acres on site and abuts an unnamed Tributary to Hampshire Creek.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 30, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Christiansen Farms, LRC-2017-11

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SE of Egyptian Trail and Offner Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Will** City: Monee

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.37813°N, Long. -87.74218° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Black Walnut Creek

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Kankakee (07120001)**

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: March 30, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): March 23, 2017

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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 7.5 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: Black Walnut Creek is mapped as a blue-line stream on the USGS Maps.
- 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: .

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 subject headwater wetland complex extends off-site where it forms a channel that meets other arms of the same hydric soil tributary complex that all merge with Black Walnut Creek.**
 - 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: **7.5** 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: Field probes on March 23, 2017.
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:Steger HA 209, 1966, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Steger 7.5", 1990, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Will County, Illinois (2004).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Steger, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005-2012.
 - 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: Site visit to walk wetland which was fed by multiple drain tiles, and had two small channels outletting to the SE where it met flow from other arms of the tributary that all combined to form a channel that intersected with Black Walnut Creek to the SE.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): February 7, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, The Bridge Community Church, LRC-2017-50

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 302 East Euclid Avenue

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Prospect Heights

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.08833°N, Long. -87.92878° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: McDonald 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: February 7, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): January 26, 2017

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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: 300 linear feet: 3 width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: acres.

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

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands. Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: Tributary to McDonald Creek is 3 feet wide and about 1 foot deep, and flows year round based on maps and aerials.
 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: **300** linear feet **3** 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.

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: Midwest Ecological Wetland Delineation Report dated September 29, 2016.
 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: Arlington Heights HA 67, 1963,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Arlington Heights 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Arlington Heights,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List,
 FEMA/FIRM maps:
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005, 2012.
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: Walked site on January 26, 2017 to view RPW waterway with strong flow.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 1, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Village of Fox Lake, LRC-2017-52

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Route 12 & State Park Road to Route 132

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Lake** City: Fox Lake
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.42969°N, Long. -88.19147° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Fox River

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

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

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

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

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: January 27, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): January 26, 2017

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: 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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or 0.56 acres.

Wetlands: 3.15 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Fox Chain-of-Lakes**.

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

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).

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent": Wetlands A, B & F are all large wetland complexes that directly abut Nippersink Lake without separation.

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, 0.56 acres.
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: 2.65 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: Direct tributary of Nippersink Lake has year-round flow based on maps and aerials.
- 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: .

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: **Tributary to Nippersink Lake bisects wetlands C & D.**
- 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: **0.5** 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: Midwest Ecological Wetland Delineation Report dated December 12, 2016.
- 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: Fox Lake HA 151, 1965, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Fox Lake 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Lake County, Illinois (2005).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Fox Lake, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Lake County ADID, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005-2012.
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: Site visit to walk wetland boundaries with wetland consultant on January 26, 2017.

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): March 13, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Wilton Management, LRC-2017-65

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NW of I-355 and 75th Street

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **DuPage** City: Woodridge
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.75355°N, Long. -88.0383° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Crabtree 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: February 23, 2017
 Field Determination. Date(s): February 17, 2017

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: 3.42 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

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: 934048 acres

Drainage area: 836673 acres

Average annual rainfall: 37.97 inches

Average annual snowfall: 33.5 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through 4 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 30 (or more) river miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1-2 river miles from RPW.

Project waters are 30 (or more) aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1-2 aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Water drains west via storm sewers to Crabtree Creek, to Prentiss Creek to East Branch DuPage River, to DuPage River, and finally into the Des Plaines River (TNW).

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

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

Tributary stream order, if known: 3.

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

Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain:
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: Piped via storm sewers in beginning.

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

Average width: 2 feet
Average depth: 2 feet
Average side slopes: **Vertical (1:1 or less).**

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: Stable concrete pipe.

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

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1 %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

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

Describe flow regime: Water flows during rain events and afterwards for several days during the growing season.

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined.** Characteristics: All drainage leaves site via concrete pipe.

Subsurface flow: **No.** 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): Water stain in pipe
 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 clear.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Parking lot run-off.

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: 3.42 acres

Wetland type. Explain: Emergent with ring of trees and shrubs.

Wetland quality. Explain: Moderate.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Intermittent flow**. Explain: Wetland receives inputs from all sides from roadway drainage and parking lot slotted curbs, as well as pump house from detention basin for I-355. Water ponds in wetland and slowly drains out via storm pipe over several days..

Surface flow is: **Overland sheetflow**

Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **No**. 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 **30 (or more)** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **30 (or more)** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: **Wetland to navigable waters**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **50 - 100-year** floodplain.

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: Water is mostly clear due to vegetation.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Parking lot run-off.

(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: Large wetland complex with diverse vegetative layers.

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **1**

Approximately (3.42) 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>
Area 1	Y	3.42			

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The wetland is adjacent and contiguous to the tributary to Crabtree Creek, which has seasonal relative permanent flow, and exhibits a surface water connection to a traditional navigable waterway. This surface water connection demonstrates the ability of the tributary to carry pollutants, flood waters, nutrients and organic carbon to the TNW. The adjacent wetlands have the ability to reduce the amount of pollutants and floodwaters reaching the TNW. The headwater wetland is receiving a percentage of its water from groundwater and mostly from runoff from the surrounding parking lots and roadways before it flows into Des Plaines River. Wetlands such as these provide stormwater storage, habitat, sediment/toxicant retention and nutrient removal/transformation. The decrease of sedimentation, pollutants, flooding, nutrients and habitat provided by the subject wetland provides a positive effect to the downstream relatively permanent waters and traditional navigable waters..

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

1. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D: .
2. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D: The wetland alone, and in combination with other area wetlands, significantly affect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Des Plaines River. Stomwater storage provided by the subject wetland, and the detention basin along I-355, affect the frequency and extent of downstream flooding, decreasing flood peaks in the Des Plaines River, and in turn impacting navigation and downstream bank erosion and sedimentation. The sediment and pollutant/toxicant retention provided by the subject wetland has a direct positive effect on the Des Plaines River in regards to navigation and aquatic food webs that are not adapted to thrive in sediment-choked environments. These factors contribute to the finding of a significant nexus between the on-site wetland and the TNW.
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: **3.42** 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).

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

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: .

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: V3 Companies Wetland Delineation and Assessment Report dated October 29, 2016.
- 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: Wheaton HA 148, 1965, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Wheaton 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage County, Illinois (1999).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Wheaton, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005-2012.
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: The subject wetland acts as a localized detention area, and the pipe to the west had a large amount of debris around the inlet indicative of large flows. The size and vegetation indicate ponded water most of the time, and that the site has a large bounce with respect to water levels.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 21, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, FPDCC, LRC-2017-69

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Cranberry Slough Nature Preserve

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Willow Springs
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.71502°N, Long. -87.86617° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Crooked Creek

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Chicago (07120003)**

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: March 21, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): March 17, 2017

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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: 2500 linear feet: 2 width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: acres.

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

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: Crooked Creek is fed by a large wetland complex, and is a defined RPW waterway with year-round flow.
 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: **2500** linear feet **2** 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.

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: FPDCC Map.
 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: Palos Park HA 145, 1966,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palos Park 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pick List.
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Pick List,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List,
 FEMA/FIRM maps:
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005-2012.
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: Site visit on March 17, 2017 to view area and walk creek channel..

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 16, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, KWM Gutterman, LRC-2017-73

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NW of Channahon Road and Larkin Avenue

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: Will City: Joliet

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.4913°N, Long. -88.1478° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: I&M Canal

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

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: February 23, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): February 17, 2017

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: 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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 1.61 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Des Plaines River.**

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

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).

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent": Wetlands 2 & 5 abut the I&M Canal, while Wetland 1 is immediately adjacent, separated only by a small berm.

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: 1.61 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: .

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.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Bollinger, Lach & Associates, Inc. Wetland Delineation and Assessment Report dated January 22, 2017.
- 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:Channahon HA 362, 1971, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Channahon 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Will County, Illinois (2004).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Channahon, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): 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: Site visit on February 17, 2017 to walk site and wetland boundaries.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 9, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, KDOT, LRC-2017-88

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Randall Road

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

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.99858°N, Long. -88.3364° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Otter Creek

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

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

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

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

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: February 16, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): February 14, 2017

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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: 50 linear feet: 8 width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 0.61 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands. Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: Otter Creek is a mapped blue-line stream; and the tributary to Otter Creek to the south shows water in all available aerials, and is mapped as ADID (but is not in the review area).
 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: **50** linear feet **8** 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: **Site 5 Wetland is connected to Site 1 Wetland via a culvert under Randall Road, and historically were part of a single wetland complex with water coming in from the east and flowing south, then water flows north via culverts to the tributary of Otter Creek.**
 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: **0.61** 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: Huff & Huff, Inc. Wetland and Waters of the U.S. Investigation Report dated July 2015..
 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, 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: Geneva,
 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): 2005-2014.
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: Site visit on February 14, 2017 to observe flow through wetlands and into tributary to Otter Creek to the north. Otter Creek is 8 feet wide and 1 foot deep, and has been observed with flowing water for over 2 decades personally.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 15, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Adar Ridgeport, LRC-2017-89

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NE of Kavanaugh Road and Murphy Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Will** City: **Wilmington**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.32831°N, Long. -88.20758° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Claypool Ditch

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Kankakee (07120001)**

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: February 22, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): February 17, 2017

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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: 1000 linear feet: 8 width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 0.8 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **1987 Delineation Manual**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands. Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: Agricultural Ditch 9 is 8 feet wide and 1-2 feet deep, and is fed by multiple drain tiles, and has year-round flow..
- 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: **1000** linear feet **8** 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: **Wetland/Waters 9 abuts a ditch to the west that has relatively purmanent flow; and which the landowner states flows to the Claypool Ditch, and into the Kankakee River.**
- 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: **0.8** acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: CBBEL Jurisdictional Determination Report dated February 6, 2017.
- 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:Wilmington HA 306, 1971,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Wilmington 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Will County, Illinois (2004).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Wilmington,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List,
 FEMA/FIRM maps:
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005-2012.
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: Site visit on February 17, 2017 where I met the landowner who is selling to the developer; he drove me around and explained the history of all the ponds and ditches on the property, and where it flows to.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): March 16, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Village of Oak Lawn, LRC-2017-113

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 159th Street E. of Harlem Ave

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Oak Lawn

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.60805°N, Long. -87.78542° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Tinley Creek

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

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

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

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

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: February 23, 2017

Field Determination. Date(s): February 17, 2017

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

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or 0.16 acres.

Wetlands: 1.44 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Midwest Supplement**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

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

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands. Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

- TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: WOUS 2 is 8 feet wide and 1-2 feet deep, and flows year-round. The other tributary to Tinley Creek off of Oak Park Avenue is 6 feet wide and 1 foot deep, and has year-round flow.
 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:

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: **Site 2 Wetland directly abuts Site 2 WOUS, and is part of the floodplain of the tributary as well. Site 6 Wetland abuts the tributary to Tinley Creek where it bisects the wetland further east of the area of review.**
 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: **1.44** 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 and Waters of the U.S. Investigation Report dated October 2016, prepared by Huff & Huff, Inc.
 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: Tinley Park HA 152, 1965,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Tinley Park 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Tinley Park,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Pick List,
 FEMA/FIRM maps:
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005-2012.
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: Site visit on February 17, 2017 to walk wetland and determine adjacency to RPW's.