

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 01-Apr-2009

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2008-00638-JD1

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State : IL - Illinois
County/parish/borough: []
City: Chicago
Lat: 41.710974114282294
Long: -87.540437
Universal Transverse Mercator
Folder UTM List
UTM list determined by folder location
 ● NAD83 / UTM zone 37S
Waters UTM List
UTM list determined by waters location
 ● NAD83 / UTM zone 37S

Name of nearest waterbody: Calumet River
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW): Calumet River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 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 the action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:

Office Determination Date: 15-May-2009
 Field Determination Date(s):

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.

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: Traditional navigable waterway with interstate commerce usage of barges.

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:¹

Water Name	Water Type(s) Present
Calumet River	TNWs, including territorial seas

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

Area: (m²)
 Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:

based on:
 OHWM Elevation: (if known)

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands:³

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

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

1. TNW

TNW Name	Summarize rationale supporting determination:
Calumet River	The Calumet River is listed as a Section 10 Navigable Waterway throughout.

2. Wetland Adjacent to TNW

Not Applicable.

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

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

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size:
 Drainage area:
 Average annual rainfall: inches
 Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.
 Tributary flows through tributaries before entering TNW.
 :Number of tributaries

Project waters are river miles from TNW.
 Project waters are river miles from RPW.
 Project Waters are aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
 Project waters are aerial(straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.

Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW:⁵

Tributary Stream Order, if known:

Not Applicable.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:

Tributary is:
 Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Primary tributary substrate composition:

Not Applicable.

Tributary (conditions, stability, presence, geometry, gradient):

Not Applicable.

(c) Flow:
Not Applicable.

Surface Flow is:
Not Applicable.

Subsurface Flow:
Not Applicable.

Tributary has:
Not Applicable.

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction:

High Tide Line indicated by:
Not Applicable.

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
Not Applicable.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Not Applicable.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:
Not Applicable.

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:
(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties:
Not Applicable.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is:
Not Applicable.

Surface flow is:
Not Applicable.

Subsurface flow:
Not Applicable.

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
Not Applicable.

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:
Not Applicable.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Not Applicable.

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports:
Not Applicable.

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

All wetlands being considered in the cumulative analysis:
Not Applicable.

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:
Not Applicable.

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.

Significant Nexus: Not Applicable

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE:

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands:

Wetland Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Calumet River	TNWs, including territorial seas	56.388	-
Total:		56.388	0

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:
Not Applicable.

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:⁸
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:
Not Applicable.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters:⁹
Not Applicable.

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:¹⁰
Not Applicable.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:
 Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:
 Not Applicable.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS. INCLUDING WETLANDS

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):

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:
 Not Applicable.

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.
 Not Applicable.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD

(listed items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference below):

Data Reviewed	Source Label	Source Description
--Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	-	-
--Corps navigable waters study	-	-
--U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas	-	-
--U.S. Geological Survey map(s).	-	-
--Previous determination(s).	-	-
--Applicable/supporting case law	-	-

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Description
The Calumet River is a recognized Section 10 navigable waterway throughout its reach.

- 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.
- 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.
- 6-A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.
- 7-Ibid.
- 8-See Footnote #3.
- 9-To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
- 10-Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the

process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):** 12-Jun-2008**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** Chicago District, LRC-2008-00282-JD1**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State : IL - Illinois
County/parish/borough: McHenry
City: McHenry
Lat: 42.36761015651767
Long: -88.2157076182493
Universal Transverse Mercator
Folder UTM List
UTM list determined by folder location
 ● NAD83 / UTM zone 38S
Waters UTM List
UTM list determined by waters location

Name of nearest waterbody: Pistakee Lake
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW): Fox River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 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 the action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:

Office Determination Date:

Field Determination Date(s): 12-Jun-2008

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.

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: Pistakee Lake is part of the navigable Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.**a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:¹**

Water Name	Water Type(s) Present
Pistakee Lake	TNWs, including territorial seas

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:Area: (m²)

Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:

based on:
 OHWM Elevation: (if known)

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands:³

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

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

1. TNW

TNW Name	Summarize rationale supporting determination:
Pistakee Lake	The Courts declared the Chain-O-Lakes navigable in a 1985 lawsuit.

2. Wetland Adjacent to TNW
 Not Applicable.

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

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

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size:
 Drainage area:
 Average annual rainfall: inches
 Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.
 Tributary flows through tributaries before entering TNW.
 :Number of tributaries

Project waters are river miles from TNW.
 Project waters are river miles from RPW.
 Project Waters are aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
 Project waters are aerial(straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.

Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW:⁵

Tributary Stream Order, if known:
 Not Applicable.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:

Tributary is:
 Not Applicable.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
 Not Applicable.

Primary tributary substrate composition:
 Not Applicable.

Tributary (conditions, stability, presence, geometry, gradient):
 Not Applicable.

(c) Flow:
Not Applicable.

Surface Flow is:
Not Applicable.

Subsurface Flow:
Not Applicable.

Tributary has:
Not Applicable.

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction:

High Tide Line indicated by:
Not Applicable.

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
Not Applicable.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Not Applicable.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:
Not Applicable.

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:
(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties:
Not Applicable.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is:
Not Applicable.

Surface flow is:
Not Applicable.

Subsurface flow:
Not Applicable.

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
Not Applicable.

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:
Not Applicable.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Not Applicable.

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports:
Not Applicable.

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

All wetlands being considered in the cumulative analysis:
Not Applicable.

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:
Not Applicable.

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.

Significant Nexus: Not Applicable

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE:

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands:

Wetland Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Pistakee Lake	TNWs, including territorial seas	-	10117140
Total:		0	10117140

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:⁸

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters:⁹

Not Applicable.

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:¹⁰

Not Applicable.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS. INCLUDING WETLANDS

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):

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:

Not Applicable.

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.

Not Applicable.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD

(listed items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference below):

Data Reviewed	Source Label	Source Description
--Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant	-	-
--Corps navigable waters study	-	-
--U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas	-	-
--Applicable/supporting case law	-	-

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Description

Pistakee Lake is navigable in-fact, and part of the Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.

- 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.
- 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.
- 6-A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.
- 7-Ibid.
- 8-See Footnote #3.
- 9 -To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
- 10-Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 12-Jun-2008

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2008-00282-JD2

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State : IL - Illinois
County/parish/borough: McHenry
City: McHenry
Lat: 42.36761015651767
Long: -88.2157076182493
Universal Transverse Mercator
Folder UTM List
UTM list determined by folder location
 ● NAD83 / UTM zone 38S
Waters UTM List
UTM list determined by waters location
Name of nearest waterbody: Pistakee Lake
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW): Fox River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 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 the action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:

Office Determination Date:
 Field Determination Date(s): 12-Jun-2008

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

There "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.
 Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
 Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.

Explain:

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:¹

Water Name	Water Type(s) Present
Wetland 1	Wetlands adjacent to TNWs

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

Area: (m²)
Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:

based on:
 OHWM Elevation: (if known)

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands:³

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

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

1. TNW
 Not Applicable.

2. Wetland Adjacent to TNW

Wetland Name	Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent":
Wetland 1	Wetland is directly abutting the navigable lake.

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

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

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size:
 Drainage area:
 Average annual rainfall: inches
 Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.
 Tributary flows through tributaries before entering TNW.
 :Number of tributaries

Project waters are river miles from TNW.
 Project waters are river miles from RPW.
 Project Waters are aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
 Project waters are aerial(straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.

Explain:
 Identify flow route to TNW:⁵

Tributary Stream Order, if known:
 Not Applicable.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:

Tributary is:
 Not Applicable.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
 Not Applicable.

Primary tributary substrate composition:
 Not Applicable.

Tributary (conditions, stability, presence, geometry, gradient):
 Not Applicable.

(c) Flow:
Not Applicable.

Surface Flow is:
Not Applicable.

Subsurface Flow:
Not Applicable.

Tributary has:
Not Applicable.

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction:

High Tide Line indicated by:
Not Applicable.

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
Not Applicable.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Not Applicable.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:
Not Applicable.

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:
(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties:
Not Applicable.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is:
Not Applicable.

Surface flow is:
Not Applicable.

Subsurface flow:
Not Applicable.

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
Not Applicable.

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:
Not Applicable.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Not Applicable.

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports:
Not Applicable.

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

All wetlands being considered in the cumulative analysis:
Not Applicable.

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:
Not Applicable.

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.

Significant Nexus: Not Applicable

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE:

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands:

Wetland Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Wetland 1	Wetlands adjacent to TNWs	-	4046.856
Total:		0	4046.856

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:⁸

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:

Not Applicable.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:

Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Not Applicable.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters:⁹

Not Applicable.

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:¹⁰

Not Applicable.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:
 Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:
 Not Applicable.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS. INCLUDING WETLANDS

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):

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:
 Not Applicable.

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.
 Not Applicable.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD

(listed items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference below):

Data Reviewed	Source Label	Source Description
--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	-	-
--U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas	-	-
--U.S. Geological Survey map(s).	-	-
--USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey.	-	-
--National wetlands inventory map(s).	-	-
--Other information	-	-

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Description
The subject wetland is adjacent and contiguous with the navigable in-fact lake.

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.
 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.
 6-A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.
 7-Ibid.
 8-See Footnote #3.

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

¹⁰ -Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 20-Oct-2008

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, LRC-2008-00574-JD1

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State : IL - Illinois
 County/parish/borough: McHenry
 City: Lakemoor
 Lat: 42.33297714801556
 Long: -88.21302941449781
 Universal Transverse Mercator: Folder UTM List
 UTM list determined by folder location
 ● NAD83 / UTM zone 38S
 Waters UTM List
 UTM list determined by waters location
 ● NAD83 / UTM zone 38S
 Name of nearest waterbody: Lily Lake Drain
 Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW): Fox River
 Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 07120008

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 the action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION:

Office Determination Date: 14-Nov-2008

Field Determination Date(s): 05-Nov-2008

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

There "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area.

Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

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

Explain:

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area:¹

Water Name	Water Type(s) Present
Wetland A	Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

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

Area: (m²)

Linear: (m)

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction:

based on:

OHWM Elevation: (if known)

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands:³

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

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

1. TNW

Not Applicable.

2. Wetland Adjacent to TNW

Not Applicable.

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

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

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size: 1008237 acres

Drainage area: 393887 acres

Average annual rainfall: 38 inches

Average annual snowfall: 35.8 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through [] tributaries before entering TNW.

:Number of tributaries

Project waters are 2-5 river miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.

Project Waters are 2-5 aenal (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) aenal(straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries.

Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW:⁵

Wetland drains via Lily Lake Drain to Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem.

Tributary Stream Order, if known:

Not Applicable.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics:

Tributary is:

Not Applicable.

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

Not Applicable.

Primary tributary substrate composition:

Not Applicable.

Tributary (conditions, stability, presence, geometry, gradient):

Not Applicable.

(c) Flow:

Not Applicable.

Surface Flow is:

Not Applicable.

Subsurface Flow:

Not Applicable.

Tributary has:

Not Applicable.

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction:

High Tide Line indicated by:

Not Applicable.

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:

Not Applicable.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

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

Not Applicable.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports:

Not Applicable.

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland Name	Size (Acres)	Wetland Type	Wetland Quality	Cross or Serve as State Boundaries. Explain
Wetland A	1	Mixed open water with forested fringe.	Medium	

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is:

Wetland Name	Flow	Explain
Wetland A	Intermittent flow.	

Surface flow is:

Wetland Name	Flow	Characteristics
Wetland A	Discrete and confined	Water flows during rain events as this wetland serves as a natural stormwater retention area.

Subsurface flow:

Wetland Name	Subsurface Flow	Explain Findings	Dye (or other) Test
Wetland A	Unknown		

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Wetland Name	Directly Abutting	Discrete Wetland Hydrologic Connection	Ecological Connection	Separated by Berm/Barrier
Wetland A	Yes			

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW:

Wetland Name	River Miles From TNW	Aerial Miles From TNW	Flow Direction	Within Floodplain
Wetland A	2-5	2-5	Wetland to navigable waters	50 - 100-year

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

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

Wetland Name	Explain
Wetland A	Identify specific pollutants, if known Road salt, sediment.

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports:

Wetland Name	Riparian Buffer	Characteristics	Vegetation	Explain
Wetland A				

Habitat for:

Wetland Name	Habitat	Federally Listed Species	Explain Findings	Spawn Area	Explain Findings	Other Environmentally Sensitive Species	Explain Findings	Aquatic/Wildlife Diversity	Explain Findings
Wetland A	X							X	Observed ducks, as well as raccoon tracks and other wildlife usage.

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

All wetlands being considered in the cumulative analysis:
Not Applicable.

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:
Not Applicable.

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.

Findings for: Wetland A

The wetland is adjacent and contiguous to Lily Lake Drain, 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 from runoff from the surrounding uplands before it flows into Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem. 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. The wetland alone, and in combination with other area wetlands, significantly affect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem. Stormwater storage provided by the subject wetlands affect the frequency and extent of downstream flooding, decreasing flood peaks in the Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem, 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 Fox River Chain-O-Lakes ecosystem 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.

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE:

1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands:
Not Applicable.

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:
Not Applicable.

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:⁸
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:
Not Applicable.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:
Not Applicable.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs:
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

Wetland Name	Type	Size (Linear) (m)	Size (Area) (m ²)
Wetland A	Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs	-	4046.856
Total:		0	4046.856

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters:⁹
Not Applicable

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:¹⁰
Not Applicable.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:
Not Applicable.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area:
Not Applicable.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS

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):

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:
Not Applicable.

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.
Not Applicable.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD

(listed items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference below)

Data Reviewed	Source Label	Source Description
-Data sheets prepared by the Corps	-	-
-U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas	-	-
-U.S. Geological Survey map(s)	-	-
-USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey	-	-
-National wetlands inventory map(s)	-	-
-Photographs	-	-
-Aerial	-	-
-Applicable/supporting case law	-	-

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

Description

Prior involvement with the subject wetland, as well as the drainage in the area through multiple other cases. Wetland elevation has been the same in the 10 plus years of observation; and flow observed in the past.

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.

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.

⁶ A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

⁷ Ibid

⁸ See Footnote #3

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

¹⁰ Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapans