

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): October 17, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Al Kowbel, 200300561

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 21313 Route 14

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: McHenry City: Harvard
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.39369°N, Long. -88.60689° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Rush 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: September 30, 2016
Field Determination. Date(s): September 28, 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: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
Wetlands: 2.3 acres.

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

Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):3

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

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

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

3 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: **Pick List**.

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

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”:

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size: 808223 acres
Drainage area: 285088 acres
Average annual rainfall: 36.00 inches
Average annual snowfall: 35.8 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through 1 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 30 (or more) river miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.
Project waters are 30 (or more) 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: Water flows out of wetland via defined channel to the north, turns east and goes under Route 14 via a 30" concrete culvert pipe, and continues east along the hunt club property until it intersects a tributary of

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.

Rush Creek which flows north into Rush Creek. Rush Creek is a tributary of the Kishwaukee River, which flows into the Rock River (TNW).

Tributary stream order, if known: 2.

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

Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: .
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: Tributary flow in back yards has been piped in some

portions, and landscaped in others immediately north of the subject wetland, then forms a natural channel that heads east under Route 14.

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

Average width: 1 feet
Average depth: 0.5 feet
Average side slopes: **3:1**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

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

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

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

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1-2 %

(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: Tributary flows during and after rain events; then dries out to a trickle.

Other information on duration and volume: .

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**. Characteristics: Defined bed and bank.

Subsurface flow: **Unknown**. Explain findings: Located secondary flow route via burried historic pipe to the west, that also goes into Rush Creek; but not certain of where it connects or how it might take flow away from overland route.

Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (check all indicators that apply):
 clear, natural line impressed on the bank the presence of litter and debris
 changes in the character of soil destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 shelving the presence of wrack line
 vegetation matted down, bent, or absent sediment sorting
 leaf litter disturbed or washed away scour
 sediment deposition multiple observed or predicted flow events
 water staining abrupt change in plant community
 other (list):
 Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ Explain: .

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

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

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: Water is clear, filters through wetland before draining via channel.

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: 2.3 acres

Wetland type. Explain: Emergent and open water.

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 takes water from multiple sources, then dries out via pipe constructed in road crossing which sets elevation of water in wetland.

Surface flow is: **Overland sheetflow**

Characteristics: Large wetland with multiple water inputs that sheet flows and goes into cut channels in wetland to outlet pipe.

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 **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 clear.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Road salt, grease and oils.

(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 adjacent to farm land and open space provides habitat for a variety of aquatic species, birds and wildlife.

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

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

Approximately (2.3) 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>
Wetland 1	Y	2.3			

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The wetland is adjacent and contiguous to the tributary to Rush Creek, which has intermittent 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 the Rock 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 Rock River. Stormwater storage provided by the subject wetlands affect the frequency and extent of downstream flooding, decreasing flood peaks in the Rock 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 Rock 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: **1000** 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: **2.3** acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

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

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

E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):¹⁰

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

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

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: .
- Wetlands: acres.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: .
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:Harvard HA 496, 1973, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Harvard 7.5", 1970, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of McHenry County, Illinois (2001).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Harvard, .
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): McHenry County ADID, Pick List, .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 2005, 2008, 2012, 2014.
or Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: 2003 Cease & Desist 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 has a clear defined connection to Rush Creek, which is only 0.5 miles from the subject wetland, and is mapped as a blue-line stream on the USGS Maps. Flow has been observed coming from the subject wetland into the tributary and under Route 14 into Rush Creek on several occasions by two Corps representatives. Neighbors say they observe flow in the channel after every rain for the past 20 years.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): October 31, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Village of Tinley Park, 200400102

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NW Corner of 191st & Harlem Avenue

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Tinley Park
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.55005°N, Long. -87.79952° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Midlothian 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: October 6, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): October 3, 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: 1000 linear feet: 12 width (ft) and/or 0.39 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: WOUS 1 (Union Drainage Ditch) is 12 feet wide and 2-4 feet deep, and flows year-round based on all available information and site visits.
 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: Hey and Associates, Inc. September 16, 2016 Wetland Delineation Report.
 Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
 Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
 Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
 Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
 Corps navigable waters' study:
 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: Soil Survey of DuPage and Part of Cook (1979),
 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, 2008, 2012, 2014.
or Other (Name & Date):
 Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: February 26, 2004 Letter for 200400102.
 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: WOUS 1 (Union Drainage Ditch) is a blue line stream on USGS Maps, and has year round flow as documented back in 2004, and today in 2016.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 9, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Philips Park, LRC-2009-550

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 1000 Ray Moses Drive

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

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.73953°N, Long. -88.29604° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Waubonsie 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: November 9, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): November 4, 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 acres.

Wetlands: 4.25 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: Piped tributary flow directly to Fox River flows year round based on size and flow observed.
 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: **Mastadon Lake is drained by the piped RPW tributary of the Fox 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: **4.25** 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: Hey and Associates, Inc. map of lake and storm sewer connection to Fox River.
 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, Aurora South.
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Aurora South 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List.
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Aurora South,
 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): Map provided by applicant shows direct flow route to Fox River; engineering plans show pipe was set to drain lake as it is below the NWL.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Site visit on November 4, 2016 to observe pipe location and flow to Fox River.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): October 31, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Diageo, LRC-2016-537

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NE of 143rd Street & Lincoln Highway

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

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.62635°N, Long. -88.213° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: West Branch Norman Drain

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: October 6, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): October 3, 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: 3000 linear feet: 8 width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 1.63 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: The West Branch Norman Drain is a direct tributary of the DuPage River, about 1 mile east; and has year round flow as documented in historic aerals. This waterway 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: **3000** 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 Site 1 is a large sloping wetland that run along the south bank of the West Branch Norman Drain; while Wetland Site 3 is separated by a RR berm that has a pipe connection to the creek where it cut off the direct connection historically.**
 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: **1.63** 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 June 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: Normantown HA 210, 1966,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Normantown 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: Normantown,
 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, 2008, 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 October 3, 2016 to walk wetland boundaries and document adjacency.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): October 31, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Indiana Belt R.R., LRC-2016-670

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: I-57 & Little Calumet River

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Dixmoor
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.63946°N, Long. -87.6623° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Little Calumet River

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

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: October 6, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): October 3, 2016

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: 0.2 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: **Little Calumet 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": Wetland 1 extends up bank from the river on a shelf; and Wetland 2 is immediately adjacent, and sometimes flows through fill and into river.

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: 300 linear feet 50 width (ft), Or, acres.
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: 0.29 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: CBBEL Wetland/Waters of the U.S. Assessment Report dated July 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:Blue Island HA 153, 1966, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Blue Island 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: Blue Island, .
- 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 October 3, 2016 to walk bank of Little Calumet River and observe flagging of wetlands.

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

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): October 31, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Schaumburg School District 54, LRC-2016-697

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SW Corner of Thacker Street and Verde Drive

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Schaumburg
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.03532°N, Long. -88.05629° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Salt Creek

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Des Plaines (07120004)**

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

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

- Office (Desk) Determination. Date: October 11, 2016
 Field Determination. Date(s): October 7, 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: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
Wetlands: 1.58 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: 36.27 inches
Average annual snowfall: 38.0 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

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

Project waters are 30 (or more) river miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.
Project waters are 30 (or more) 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: Wetland drains directly into a tributary of Salt Creek, which flows into the Des Plaines.
Tributary stream order, if known: 2.

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

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

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

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

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

Average width: 2 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: Tributary is stable.

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

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 1 %

(c) Flow:

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

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

Describe flow regime: Wetland drains out via tributary during and after most rain events as the wetland also serves as detention for the surrounding area..

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**. Characteristics: Defined bed and bank.

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

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (check all indicators that apply):
 clear, natural line impressed on the bank the presence of litter and debris
 changes in the character of soil destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 shelving the presence of wrack line
 vegetation matted down, bent, or absent sediment sorting
 leaf litter disturbed or washed away scour
 sediment deposition multiple observed or predicted flow events
 water staining abrupt change in plant community
 other (list):
 Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ Explain:

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

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

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: Water is clear.

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: 1.58 acres

Wetland type. Explain: Mixed forested, emergent and open water.

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 is used as detention for surrounding subdivision and parks, so fills up and flows out during and after most rain events via short channel to tributary of Salt Creek.

Surface flow is: **Overland sheetflow**

Characteristics:

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 **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 clear.

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: Pond in center used by waterfowl and other birds.

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

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

Approximately (1.58) 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>
Wetland 1	Y	1.58			

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: Wetland 1 is adjacent and contiguous to a channel which has intermittent flow to the tributary to Salt Creek, which has relatively 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 wetland has 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 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. Stormwater storage provided by the subject wetlands 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: **300** 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.

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: **1.58** 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: Gary R. Weber Associates, Inc. Wetland Delineation Report dated July 22, 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: Palatine HA 87, 1964, .
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Palatine 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List, .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Palatine, .
- 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): 1988 Historical Aerial.
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 October 7, 2016 to verify wetland flagging and outlet pipe.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 3, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Love's Truck Stop, LRC-2016-713

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NW of I-90 and Route 20

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Kane** City: Hampshire
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.14806°N, Long. -88.51389° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Harmony 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: October 11, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): October 7, 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: 1000 linear feet: 10 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 is mapped as a blue-line stream on 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: .
 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: Ceso, Inc. Regulated Waters Delineation Report dated September 7, 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:Marengo South HA 463, 1972, .
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Marengo South 7.5", 1968, 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: Marengo South, .
 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: Site visit on October 7, 2016 to view water in channel.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): 10/27/16

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, K-Five Construction, LRC-2016-734

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **Cook** City: Lemont

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.6866°N, Long. -87.9588° 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: 10/27/16

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: 0.25 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: **Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal.**

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”: The subject wetland is located south of a railroad embankment separating the subject wetland from the wetlands north of the railroad embankment. The wetlands north of the railroad embankment are adjacent to the I&M Canal, a TNW. The wetlands north and south of the railroad embankment are hydrologically connected via a culvert. Based on this connection, the subject wetland was determined to be adjacent to the TNW .

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: 0.25 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: .
- 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: Pick List, 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): 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: .

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 21, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, K-Mine Park, LRC-2016-791

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 500 S. Kankakee Street

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

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.23276°N, Long. -88.24221° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Mazon River

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: November 21, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): November 18, 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 acres.

Wetlands: 6.34 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: Tributary of Mazon River flows continuously due to size of watershed and drainage off-site.
 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 1 & 2 are connected, and flow off-site to the west to the Mazon River via a tributary connection.**
 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: **6.43** 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 Environmental, Inc. Wetland Assessment Report dated May 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, Essex.
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Essex 7.5", 1973, 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: Essex, .
 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 November 18, 2016; spoke to on-site staff who stated water flows in ditch all the time; and showed me a 2012 drainage study.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 22, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Rodakrel Property, LRC-2016-794

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: 153 W 375 N

State: Indiana County/parish/borough: **Porter** City: Valparaiso

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.49021°N, Long. -87.09692° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: Pepper Creek

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Little Calumet (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: November 22, 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:

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: 268 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:

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: Unnamed tributary of Pepper Creek is directly connected to Pepper Creek just beyond the property boundary, 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:
 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: Earth-Source, Inc. Wetland Delineation Report dated 9/16/2016.
 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, Valparaiso.
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: , Valparaiso, .
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of La Porte County, Indiana (1982).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Valparaiso.
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
 FEMA/FIRM maps: .
 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
 Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): .
or Other (Name & Date): .
 Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
 Applicable/supporting case law:
 Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
 Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Site photos and maps clearly show water in direct tributary of Pepper Creek, which is mapped as a blue-line stream on the USGS Maps.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 8, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Robert J. Murphy, LRC-2016-823

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: NE of Army Trail Road and Walter Road

State: Illinois County/parish/borough: **DuPage** City: Itasca

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 41.93557°N, Long. -88.05247° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: East Branch DuPage River

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **Des Plaines (07120004)**

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

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

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: November 8, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): November 4, 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 acres.

Wetlands: 0.24 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: Tributary comes from the north through a large wetland complex, and due to size and drainage area, provide for year-round flow; and flows to the E. Br. DuPage River about 1/4 mile to the west.
 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 tributary is piped just north of the wetland, and passes underneath, then heads west where the tile has multiple blow-outs just off-site that the wetland drains into.**
 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: **0.24** acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: CBBEL Wetland Assessment Report dated October 6, 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: Lombard HA 143, 1964,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Lombard 7.5", 1993, Pick List, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of DuPage County, Illinois (1999).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Lombard,
 State/Local wetland inventory map(s): DuPage County ADID, Pick List,
 FEMA/FIRM maps:
 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 November 4, 2016 to locate wetland connection to piped tributary, and view volume of flow of tributary to make RPW call.

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

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 17, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Chicago District, Kohley Farm, LRC-2016-833

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Huntley Road, West of Randall Road

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

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 42.13852°N, Long. -88.35703° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 16

Name of nearest waterbody: S. Br. Kishwaukee River

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

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

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

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

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date: November 17, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): November 15, 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: 2000 linear feet: 3 width (ft) and/or 0.74 acres.

Wetlands: 25 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 1 and WOUS 2 are direct tributaries to the S. Br. Kishwaukee River about a mile away; and are fed by multiple tile lines giving them year-round flow inputs.
 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: **2000** 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: **Wetland A and Farmed Wetland 1 are one contiguous wetland complex that is farmed on the parcel, but not at the edge of the parcel or off-site. This large wetland complex directly abuts a tributary of the S. Br. Kishwaukee 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: **25** 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 October 28, 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:Crystal Lake HA 253, 1967,
 USGS NHD data.
 USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
 U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Crystal Lake 7.5", 1992, Pick List, Pick List,
 USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil Survey of Kane County, Illinois (2003).
 National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Crystal Lake,
 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, 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 boundaries with wetland consultant, who showed me the RPW waterways, explained where all the tile lines were, and how it was all connected.