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): February 15, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: LRB 2010-01519 (Jewsih Home of Rochester) – Wetland C.

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: New York County/parish/borough: Monroe City: Rochester
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 43.1057° N, Long. -77.5870° W
Universal Transverse Mercator:
Name of nearest waterbody: Allen Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Irondequoit Bay
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Irondequoit Bay

- [x] 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):

- [x] Office (Desk) Determination. Date: December 16, 2016
- [x] Field Determination. Date(s): June 1, 2016; September 19, 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: *Click here to enter text.*

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 waters[2] (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: acres

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

   Elevation of established OHWM (if known): Unknown

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

- [x] Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: Site visits were conducted on June 1 and September 19, 2016 at the 44-acre Jewish Home of Rochester site, located adjacent to NYS I-590 and Merdian Centre Blvd, Town of Brighton, Monroe County, New York. In addition, a review of in-house resources including, topographical maps, aerial photography and soils maps were looked at. The boundary of Wetland C (1.96 acres) was walked. No surface flows or culverts were observed going away from the wetland. No storm-drains were found near the wetland. No drainage patterns or mapped draingeways were found on aerial imagery or the USGS Pittsford quad map in close proximity to Wetland C.

---

[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.

Wetlands C (1.96 acres, PFO) boundary was walked and based on the on-site walkover and review of in-house resources it was determined the wetland is a closed depressional wetland that was not abutting or adjacent to a drainage-way nor appeared to flow directly into a drainage-way or a TNW. Access to the adjacent parcel was granted (Town of Brighton Park Land) in order to fully verify the boundary of Wetland C and determine if the wetland was isolated or regulated. It was determined Wetland C only extended a little further offsite and no connections, drainageways or drainage structures were observed near or going away from Wetland C. A review of aerial imagery indicated Wetland C to be more than 500-feet away from a stormwater detention pond to the west and 1,100-feet away to an unnamed tributary to Winston Creek to the south. Wetland C is more than 1,500 feet away from the Erie Canal to the south.

No ecological nexus to any wetlands were seen in the vicinity of the wetland. During the site visit, hydrology was not present within the wetland. There was no evidence of drainage or flow from the wetland to drainageways, roadside ditches nor appeared to flow directly into ditches or a TNW. Due to the lack of drainageways around the wetland and on-site soil conditions, it is unlikely that any shallow subsurface connection exists between wetland C and A. The area between Wetland C and A was determined to be upland exhibiting no wetland characteristics. Wetland C is physically and geographically isolated in a depression on the landscape and water would not make it to a TNW. The remaining wetlands, Wetlands A and B, will be verified under a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination.

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: *Click here to enter text.*

Summarize rationale supporting determination: *Click here to enter text.*

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent": *Click here to enter text.*

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 waterbody[4] is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

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

(i) General Area Conditions:

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

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.

☐ Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW.

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

Identify flow route to TNW[5]:
Tributary stream order, if known:

[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: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

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

Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: *Choose an item.*

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: .
Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: .
Tributary geometry: *Choose an item.*
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope):

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: *Choose an item.*
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: *Choose an item.*
Describe flow regime:.
Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: *Choose an item.* Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: Unknown Explain findings: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Dye (or other) test performed: *Click here to enter text.*

Tributary has (check all that apply):

☐ Bed and banks
☐ OHWM[6] (check all indicators that apply):
- ☐ clear, natural line impressed on the bank
- ☐ changes in the character of soil
- ☐ shelving
- ☐ vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
- ☐ leaf litter disturbed or washed away
- ☐ sediment deposition
- ☐ water staining
- ☐ other (list): *Click here to enter text.*
- ☐ the presence of litter and debris
- ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- ☐ the presence of wrack line
- ☐ sediment sorting
- ☐ scour
- ☐ multiple observed or predicted flow events
- ☐ abrupt change in plant community *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Discontinuous OHWM.[7] Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

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

☐ High Tide Line indicated by:
- ☐ oil or scum line along shore objects
- ☐ fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
- ☐ physical markings/characteristics
- ☐ tidal gauges
- ☐ other (list): *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
- ☐ survey to available datum;
- ☐ physical markings;
- ☐ vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Explain:
Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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

☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):

☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .

---

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

☐ Habitat for:

☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties:
Wetland size:
Wetland type. Explain:
Wetland quality. Explain:
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: Intermittent and Ephemeral Flow Explain:

Surface flow is: Discrete and Confined
Characteristics:.

Subsurface flow: *Choose an item.* Explain findings: *Click here to enter text.*
☐ Dye (or other) test performed: *Click here to enter text.*

(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: *Click here to enter text.*

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are *Choose an item.* river miles from TNW.
Project waters are *Choose an item.* aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: *Choose an item.*
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the *Choose an item.* 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:

(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: *Click here to enter text.*
☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: *Click here to enter text.*
☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: *Click here to enter text.*
☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: *Choose an item.*
Approximately (#) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

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

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

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

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

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

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

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: *Click here to enter text.*

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: *Click here to enter text.*.
   - ☐ 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: *Click here to enter text.*

3. **Non-RPWs[8] that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - ☐ Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):
   - ☐ Tributary waters: # linear feet # width (ft).
   - ☐ Other non-wetland waters: # acres.

   Identify type(s) of waters: *Click here to enter text.*

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: .

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 jurisidictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

   Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

---

[8]See Footnote # 3.

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

☐ Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

7. **Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.**[9]
As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

☐ Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or

☐ Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or

☐ Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

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

☐ which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.

☐ from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.

☐ which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.

☐ Interstate isolated waters. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Other factors. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: *Click here to enter text.*

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: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ 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: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Other: (explain, if not covered above): *Click here to enter text.*

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: *Click here to enter text.*.

☑ Wetlands: 1.96 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: *Click here to enter text.*.

☐ 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 or plots submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Delineation report submitted by BME Associates dated April 11, 2016 and subsequent additional information.

☑ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.

---

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

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

- [x] 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: *Click here to enter text.*
- [ ] U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: *Click here to enter text.*
  - [ ] USGS NHD data.
  - [ ] USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- [x] U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Pittsford USGS Quad, delineated parcel located
- [x] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey: USDA-NRCS Web Soil Survey – Potentially Hydric soils are found within the delineated boundary.
- [x] National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS Wetland Mapper – Mapped Federal wetlands are found adjacent to the delineated boundary.
- [x] State/Local wetland inventory map(s): NYSDEC Environmental Resource Mapper – No Mapped State regulated Wetlands are located on the delineated parcel
- [ ] FEMA/FIRM maps: *Click here to enter text.*
- [ ] 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: *Click here to enter text.* (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- [x] Photographs: [x] Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth, Bing Maps
- [ ] or [x] Other (Name & Date): Photos included with the delineation report
- [ ] Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: *Click here to enter text.*
- [ ] Applicable/supporting case law: *Click here to enter text.*
- [ ] Applicable/supporting scientific literature: *Click here to enter text.*
- [ ] Other information (please specify): *Click here to enter text.*

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Isolated wetland C (1.96 acres) was field verified by the Corps of Engineers on June 1 and September 19, 2016. The perimeter of wetland C was walked and no evidence of any connections to other waters were identified. There were no connections between the wetland and any other waters on the Pittsford Quad, the USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey and aerial imagery. The Wetland is isolated and outside the Department of the Army's jurisdiction. The determination is supported by the review of in-house resources and field verified. None of the 328.3(a)(3)(i-iii) factors are relevant in this case. The wetland doesn't support recreational or other use by interstate travelers, nor provide habitat for amphibians or other aquatic species. The wetland offers no use for industrial or commercial purposes. The wetland was determined to be isolated and therefore non-jurisdictional. The remaining wetlands, Wetland A (3.29 acres) and Wetland B (6.33 acres), will be verified under a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination.

SIGNED

Joseph M. Rowley
Project Manager

February 15, 2017
Date



Jewish Home of Rochester-Summit at Brighton
D/A Processing No. 2010-01519
Monroe County, New York
Quad: Pittsford
Sheet 1 of 7

Jewish Home of Rochester-Summit at Brighton
D/A Processing No. 2010-01519
Monroe County, New York
Quad: Pittsford
Sheet 2 of 7



BME ASSOCIATES	Scale: 1"=300'	The Summit at Brighton USGS Map Town of Brighton Monroe County, New York	Figure 2

Jewish Home of Rochester-Summit at Brighton
D/A Processing No. 2010-01519
Monroe County, New York
Quad: Pittsford
Sheet 3 of 7

LEGEND:

Site Boundary

300 0 150 300 600

Graphic Scale

BME ASSOCIATES

Scale: 1"=300'

The Summit at Brighton
Site Location Aerial Photograph
Town of Brighton
Monroe County, New York

N

Figure 1

Jewish Home of Rochester-Summit at Brighton
D/A Processing No. 2010-01519
Monroe County, New York
Quad: Pittsford
Sheet 4 of 7

LEGEND:

Site Boundary

300 0 150 300 600

Graphic Scale

BME ASSOCIATES

Scale: 1"=300'

The Summit at Brighton
Federal Wetlands
Town of Brighton
Monroe County, New York

Figure 3

Jewish Home of Rochester-Summit at Brighton
D/A Processing No. 2010-01519
Monroe County, New York
Quad: Pittsford
Sheet 5 of 7



BME ASSOCIATES	Scale: 1"=300'	The Summit at Brighton NYSDEC Freshwater Wetlands Map Town of Brighton Monroe County, New York	Figure 4

Jewish Home of Rochester-Summit at Brighton
D/A Processing No. 2010-01519
Monroe County, New York
Quad: Pittsford
Sheet 6 of 7



SOILS	HYDRIC RATING
Ca – Canandaigua Silt Loam	95
CIA – Collamer Silt Loam	0
HIB – Hilton Loam	0
Le – Lakemont Silt Loam	95
Ng – Niagara Silt Loam	4
SeA – Schoharie Silt Loam	3

LEGEND:

Site Boundary

300 0 150 300 600

Graphic Scale

BME ASSOCIATES

Scale: 1"=300'

The Summit at Brighton
Monroe County Soils Map
Town of Brighton
Monroe County, New York

Figure 5

Jewish Home of Rochester-Summit at Brighton
D/A Processing No. 2010-01519
Monroe County, New York
Quad: Pittsford
Sheet 7 of 7



BME ASSOCIATES	Scale: 1"=300'	The Summit at Brighton Delineated Wetlands, Sampling Point Locations & Individual Flag Locations Town of Brighton Monroe County, New York	Figure 7