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 5, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Buffalo District, Curtin Farm LP, LRB-2017-00219

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: New York County/parish/borough: Madison Town: Oneida
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 43.08944 ° N, Long. -75.69917 ° W
Universal Transverse Mercator: Zone 18
Name of nearest waterbody: Cowaselon Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Erie Canal
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 04140202

☑ 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 20, 2017

☑ Field Determination. Date(s): May 2, 2017, June 13, 2017

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

☐ Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

☐ Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.
Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There are no "*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): *Click here to enter text.*

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: **A wetland delineation was conducted on the 219.8 acres project review area, and a wetland complex totaling 13.43 acres was identified. This wetland consists of the following habitat cover types: 3.19 acres emergent, 4.84 acres open water, 4.7 acres forested, and 0.7 acres scrub/shrub.**
The wetland complex is outside Department of the Army jurisdiction and does not meet the criteria for a jurisdictional water of the United States according to 33 CFR Part 328.3(a)(1-7) as follows:

[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.

1. Does not/has not supported interstate or foreign commerce;

2. Is not an interstate water/wetland; the wetland does not cross state boundaries;

3. The degradation or destruction of which would not affect interstate or foreign commerce and does not include such waters:
   - (i) which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes; or
   - (ii) from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; or
   - (iii) which are used or could be used for industrial purpose by industries in interstate commerce

4. Is not an impoundment of water otherwise defined as WOUS under the definition;

5. Is not a tributary of waters identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(4) of this section;

6. Is not a territorial sea;

7. Is not adjacent to waters (other than waters that are themselves wetlands) identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(6) of this section.

The wetland complex was constructed as a borrow area within an agricultural field between 1941 and 1956 from upland soils, based upon a review of historical aerial photographs, historical topographical maps and the web soil survey (see Section IV for description of these sources). The consultant to the project suggested that the soils could have been used for fill associated with the railroad just north of the site. They could have also been used for construction of the NYS Thruway to the north. It is located 960 feet south of a TNW (abandoned Erie Canal – land cut section) as the crow flies. Here it is separated by agricultural land in addition to a wide active railroad bed. The wetland complex is also located 800 feet from the RPW to the east (Cowaselon Creek – located off-site).

During the May 2017 site inspection, sheet flow was observed flowing from the wetland/pond across the farm field to a nearby intermittent tributary to the Erie Canal (in the path noted as the blue/black line on Fig 2), but not in a discrete/confined channel. It was through a 50-100 foot wide swath through a corn field, the day after an extremely large rain event in the wettest spring on record. This flow path was approximately 2,535 linear feet from the wetland complex to the Erie Canal. Evidence of a continuous flow (i.e. erosional feature, sediment deposits or other observable evidence) path was not observed in prior or subsequent site visits by the USACE or consultant (February 10, 2017 report noted that initial property review started in December 2016 and field work continued into February 2017. Consultant also visited the site in April, date not noted, July 25 and August 1, 2017.). The feature is surrounded by active farm fields (although not farmed this year due to the unusually wet conditions), with a large railroad to the north. There are no farm tiles in this field. During the May 2017 site inspection, the wetland complex had very high water elevations, upwards of 3-4 feet based upon trees and shrubs. It appears that the excavation of the feature intercepted ground water as evident by the perennial open water and surrounding gravel soils.

The complex is not adjacent to nearby streams as there was no discrete surface water connection, no evidence of a shallow subsurface connection and no ecological continuum found. There was no evidence of a shallow subsurface connection as it is not expected to go to the north as the Canal was a man-made feature. In addition, it doesn't appear to have any subsurface flow to the east or west as the pond was excavated and there is no saturation noted on any past aerial photographs to the east. It is anticipated that the saturation seen in some of the aerial photos to the north was the result of the pond overflowing as seen by the USACE in May 2017 as opposed to evidence of a shallow subsurface connection, due to the water elevations seen in the pond during the site inspection. The USACE has determined that there is no strong evidence for an ecological continuum to exist between the wetland complex and nearby streams due to the agriculture and railroad barriers.

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: *# Choose an item.*
Drainage area: *# Choose an item.*

Average annual rainfall: # inches
Average annual snowfall: # inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.

☐ Tributary flows through *Choose an item.* 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: *Click here to enter text.*

Identify flow route to TNW[5]: *Click here to enter text.*
Tributary stream order, if known: *Click here to enter text.*

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

Tributary is: ☐ Natural

☐ Artificial (man-made). Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

☐ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

[4] Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
[5] Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*
Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*
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: *Click here to enter text.*
Other information on duration and volume: *Click here to enter text.*

Surface flow is: *Choose an item.* Characteristics: *Click here to enter text.*

Subsurface flow: *Choose an item.* 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	☐ 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 *Click here to enter text.*
☐ other (list): *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:	☐ 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): *Click here to enter text.*	

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Explain: *Click here to enter text.*
Identify specific pollutants, if known: *Click here to enter text.*

[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.

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

- ☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): *Click here to enter text.*
- ☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: *Click here to enter text.*
- ☐ 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: *Click here to enter text.*

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland size: # acres

Wetland type. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

Wetland quality. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: *Choose an item.* Explain: *Click here to enter text.*

Surface flow is: *Choose an item.*

Characteristics: *Click here to enter text.*

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: *Click here to enter text.*
  - ☐ Ecological connection. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*
  - ☐ 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: *Click here to enter text.*

Identify specific pollutants, if known: *Click here to enter text.*

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):

- ☐ Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): *Click here to enter text.*
- ☐ Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: *Click here to enter text.*
- ☐ 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: *Click here to enter text.*

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)
Y/N	*#*	*Y/N*	*#*
Y/N	*#*	*Y/N*	*#*
Y/N	*#*	*Y/N*	*#*
Y/N	*#*	*Y/N*	*#*

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: *Click here to enter text.*

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: *Click here to enter text.*

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: *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.*

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

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

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

6. **Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - ☐ Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

7. **Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.[9]**
   As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.
   - ☐ Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or
   - ☐ Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
   - ☐ Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):[10]
- ☐ which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
- ☐ from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
- ☐ which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
- ☐ Interstate isolated waters. Explain: *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.

[8]See Footnote # 3.
[9] To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
[10] Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA *Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.*

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: 13.43 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, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: E.H. Frantz Environmental and C&S Engineers. This includes a surveyed 1 foot topographical map, which does not show evidence of any drainage features from the wetland complex. Also based upon the general contours flow would be expected more from the south to the north as opposed to the east or west.
- ☑ 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: soils data taken during May and June site inspections.
- ☐ Corps navigable waters' study: *Click here to enter text.*
- ☑ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: There are no NHD mapped streams on the site, and the intermittent tributary to the Erie Canal, referenced in this JD, is not identified on the NHD.
  - ☑ USGS NHD data.
  - ☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☑ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Oneida Quad, 1955 revised 1993. The site is relatively flat. The excavated basin can be identified by the change in topography, and is partially identified with wetland symbols. There are no indications of a hydrological connection between the basin and the Erie Canal to the north, nor to the Cowaselon Creek to the east. The intermittent tributary to the Erie Canal referenced in this JD to the northwest is not identified on the topographical map.
  Historical topographical maps, UNH, 1895 and 1946. Both of these maps predated the excavation of the wetland complex and the railroad. The 1895 topographical map shows minimal topographical change on the site. Cowaselon Creek is identified on the eastern side of the property, flowing north, and a tributary to the Cowaselon is identified west of the site (likely what is now the intermittent tributary to the Erie Canal). It appears that both of these features did not connect to the Erie Canal (TNW) to the north and is likely they go under the canal and flow north. It was confirmed that Cowaselon Creek flows under the Erie Canal via aqueduct as seen on Google Earth (see photo in file). The tributary was likely modified when the railroad was constructed, as it now flows into the Erie Canal.
- ☑ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Both the hard copy of the Madison County Soil survey (Sheet 10, March 1981) and the web soil survey were reviewed. The delineated feature is mapped within soil types identified as water (w) and cut and fill land (CFL). The following additional soils are mapped around the delineated feature: Fredon silt loam (Fr), Phelps Gravelly silt loam (PpA, PpB), Wampsville gravelly silt loam (WeA, WeB), Palmyra Gravelly Loam (PgA). The Fredon soils are mapped as hydric (33-65%). The CFL is mapped as hydric 1-32%. The Fredon mapped soils are less than 200 feet from the delineated feature. The excavated feature is surrounded by upland soils. Even though the feature is identified as cut and fill land in addition to water, it does not appear that the feature was completely excavated in the 1974 aerial photo provided as the base of the soil survey.
- ☑ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: Oneida Quad. The feature is identified as partial Palustrine unconsolidated bottom and partial emergent wetland.
- ☑ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): Oneida Quad. No State wetlands are mapped.
- ☑ FEMA/FIRM maps: The delineated feature is not within the FEMA mapped floodplain of Cowaselon Creek.
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: *Click here to enter text.* (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☑ Photographs: ☑ Aerial (Name & Date): Aerial photographs were examined from the following years:

1938 and 1941 (provided by consultant): the feature had not yet been constructed. There do not appear to be any wetlands or waters in the vicinity of the constructed wetland/pond. 1956 (provided by consultant): pond constructed, with no indication of a hydrologic or ecologic connection to adjacent streams/wetlands.
Google Earth Pro, various photos on varying dates examined, including: 1994, 2003, 2008 where a small potential for a connection is seen on the western edge of the pond feature in each of the photos. No channel or flow was evident when inspected during the USACE site inspections, but there was evidence of sheet flow to the north with wracking of vegetative debris on cut corn stubble from the prior year.
May 26, 2011. Site farmed, no indications of hydrologic connection.
May 28, 2015: there are no indications of hydrologic connections between the wetland and any adjacent waters.
April 13, 2017: soil saturation and ponding is clearly visible on this photo north of the delineated wetland complex.
NYS Orthos online: 2013, site farmed, no indication of hydrologic connection; 1994 and 2008, small feature noted in western side of pond potentially flowing north. 2003: Compared to all years, this is the wettest next to 2017. The area of overland flow is noted from pond to the north. The feature observed on a few of the photos on the western side of the wetland complex was not flowing at either USACE site inspections.

☐ or ☑ Other (Name & Date): Site photographs were provided with the February 10, 2017 submittal and taken during the USACE site inspections

☐ 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): Site inspections: May 2, 2017 and June 13, 2017 by USACE. During the May 2 site inspection, overland sheet flow was found from the wetland/pond to the north, then west, ultimately flowing into an off-site intermittent tributary to the Erie Canal. This inspection was performed the day after a substantial rain event, during the wettest spring on record. On June 13, the USACE found saturated conditions between the wetland/pond and the area to the north and west, but it did not contain continuous flow, nor was a discrete/confined feature found between the wetland/pond and the intermittent tributary. The perimeter of the wetland complex was traversed and no flow either to the east or west was found.

NRCS Determination: none. The applicant was asked to see if an NRCS Determination had been completed for the property. It had not, but instead the NRCS provided a hydric soils map, specific to the site. The only hydric soils mapped on the project site are to the northwest, consistent with the web soil survey.

Precipitation Data, Weather Underground: The average year to date precipitation is 10.9 inches. Average total for April is 3.19 inches. The average snowfall since each July 1 is 123.7 inches. 2017 had the highest rainfall to date out of all of the years, but there were 3 other years that had more snowfall. In addition, two past Aprils had more April rainfall than April 2017.
2017: May monthly total: 0.88 inches (April monthly total 4.95 in); Year to date total: 16.26 inches; Snowfall since July 1: 134.9 inches

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: *Click here to enter text.*

October 5, 2017

Margaret A. Crawford
Project Manager

Date