

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): August 24, 2015

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 1; SAC -2015-00619-5Z, Jessica's Landing

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: **Greenville** City: **Mauldin**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. **34.843486° N**, Long. **82.276444° W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator: **NAD 83**

Name of nearest waterbody: **UNT to UNT to Rocky Creek**

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **0305010801**

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: **August 24, 2015**

Field Determination. Date(s): **June 25, 2015**

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
- 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: **sRPW: 67.7 linear feet, pRPW: 252.8** linear feet: **2-6** width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: **0.27** acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM, 1987 Delineation Manual, Pick List

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³ [Including potentially jurisdictional features that upon assessment are NOT waters or wetlands]

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

Explain: **An upland conveyance beginning in the uplands above the wetland (west), entering the wetland, and exiting**

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.

downslope (east) and ending near the sRPW was investigated and found to have no OHWM or bed and bank features. It was therefore determined to be an entirely upland feature. It would serve to convey flow from the wetland to the downslope RPW, in addition to overland sheet flow, but is not itself a WOUS .

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: .

Summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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: 167,384 acres ; 03050108-01

Drainage area: approximately 30 acres

Average annual rainfall: 48.4 inches

Average annual snowfall: 1.4 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through 3 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 5-10 river miles from TNW.

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

Project waters are 2-5 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: They do not.

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

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: **sRPW flows to on site pRPW, which flows to an unnamed tributary, which flows to Rocky Creek, which flows to the Enoree River, a TNW.**
Tributary stream order, if known: **1.**

(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: **approximately 2-3** feet
Average depth: **approximately 2-3** 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: Slightly unstable.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: **None.**

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight.**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) **Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **Seasonal flow**

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

Describe flow regime: **Seasonal. While flow was not observed during the site visit, it is expected that water flows during wetter months and after heavy rains.**

Other information on duration and volume: **Relatively low volume. Duration is estimated to be seasonal.**

Surface flow is: **Discrete.** Characteristics: .

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 in sRPW was not observed during site visit. Water in pRPW was clear. Intact riparian buffer**

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

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

⁷Ibid.

would indicate good water quality, however the surrounding suburban development would be a source for pollutants such as sediment, pesticides, fertilizer, and fecal coliform from pet waste. Rocky Creek, to which this flows, is noted by SCDHEC as having fecal coliform bacteria excursions and an increasing trend in pH.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: **Not known, however downstream fecal coliform and pH issues have been identified by SCDHEC.**

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

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): **50+ feet, mixed pine and hardwood.**
- 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: **This headwater tributary would provide for habitat diversity within**

the aquatic community.

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: **0.27** acres

Wetland type. Explain: **Mature forested wetland.**

Wetland quality. Explain: **Relatively high quality, mature forested wetland with intact forested buffer.**

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: **They do not.**

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Ephemeral flow**. Explain: **Water was not observed flowing at the time of the site visit, but during wetter months and rain events, ephemeral flow would be present as described below.**

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**

Characteristics: **Some evidence of overland sheet flow from wetland area to sRPW, additionally a non-jurisdictional conveyance (referenced on this form) further connects the wetland and sRPW .**

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: **Non-jurisdictional conveyance (no OHWM or bed and bank) connects the wetland and sRPW.**

Ecological connection. Explain: **The wetland is in close proximity to the sRPW. Previous overland sheet flow from the wetland to the sRPW was evident at the time of the site visit. This wetland would be expected to contribute to the overall ecology of the downslope tributary and downstream TNW.**

Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **5-10** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **2-5** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

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

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** 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: **The drainage area for the sRPW is relatively small (approximately 30 acres) and is mostly forested with some surrounding suburban development. The surrounding suburban development would be a source of pollutants such as sediment, pesticides, fertilizers, and fecal coliform from pet waste. The wetland has been somewhat manipulated by the ditch that is apparently manmade and begins upslope of the wetland, terminating downslope by the sRPW. The ditch is not very deep (approximately 1 foot or less in most places) and therefore would not be expected to affect the wetland as much as a deeper ditch. Additionally, because the surrounding area is in mature forest, the wetland is otherwise undisturbed.**

Identify specific pollutants, if known: **None known, however Rocky Branch is known to have fecal coliform excursions and pH issues.**

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

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): **Liquidambar styraciflua, Quercus nigra, Ilex opaca, fairly thickly vegetated with approximately 70+% cover.**
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: **Prunus serotina, Liquidambar styraciflua, Juniperus virginiana, fairly thickly vegetated with approximately 80+% cover.**

Habitat for:

- Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
- Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
- Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
- Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: **This small wetland provides habitat diversity that would provide forage and shelter for a variety of species.**

forage and shelter for a variety of species.

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

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

Approximately (**0.27**) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
N	0.27		

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: **This wetland enhances a variety of wildlife species by providing diversity where aquatic systems adjoin uplands. Due to surrounding land uses, this wetland acts as a catch basin for adjacent uplands, filtering sediment and other pollutants and reducing the release of flood waters to the TNW. The wetland has the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that supports downstream foodwebs.**

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: .

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: **This wetland is connected to the sRPW by both overland sheet flow and by a small manmade ditch. This wetland enhances a variety of wildlife species by providing diversity where aquatic systems adjoin uplands. The chemical pollutants detected by SCDHEC in the downstream waters are not sufficiently filtered by the wetlands and will be carried to and affect the TNW. Due to surrounding land uses, this wetland acts as a catch basin for adjacent uplands, filtering sediment and other pollutants and reducing the release of flood waters to the TNW. The wetland has the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that supports downstream foodwebs. Based on the collective functions described above and their importance to the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the downstream TNW, it has been determined that there is a significant nexus between the relevant reach of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands to the downstream TNW.**

Documentation for the Record only: Significant nexus findings for seasonal RPWs and/or wetlands abutting seasonal RPWs: The sRPW is a seasonal RPW that is short in length before discharging into the on site pRPW. The sRPW has an OHWM and bed and bank and is expected to flow during wetter months. This tributary provides topographic and hydrologic changes in the landscape that support a variety of wildlife and species diversity through habitat variety. The slower flow would also be expected to allow for increased interactions between the hyporheic zone and the streamwater, further providing functionality for the overall system feeding the downstream TNW. Based on the collective functions described above and their importance to the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the downstream TNW, it has been determined that there is a significant nexus between the relevant reach of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands to the downstream 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: 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 pRPW is depicted on the topographical map as a blue line and on the soils map as a dashed line. This tributary has a strong, continuous OHWM with bed and bank features, strong sediment sorting, a clear line impressed upon the bank, and other features associated with perennial flow. Flow was observed during the site visit and is shown in photos submitted by the agent. Stream characteristics observed and available data led this office to conclude that the tributary has a perennial flow regime.**

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: **The sRPW is not depicted on the topographical map other than by crenulations in topographical contours indicating a dip in the topography. The sRPW is depicted on the soils map as a dashed line. The drainage area of the sRPW is 30 acres, which is sufficient to provide for relatively permanent flow. Stream characteristics observed and available data led this office to conclude that the tributary has a seasonal flow regime.**

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

Tributary waters: **sRPW:67.7 linear feet, pRPW 252.8 linear feet approximately 2-6 width (ft).**
 Other non-wetland waters: acres.
 Identify type(s) of waters: .

3. **Non-RPWs⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

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

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

Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
 Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

⁸See Footnote # 3.

- 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: **0.27** 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).

Explain:

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:

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): **An upland conveyance beginning in the uplands above the wetland (west), entering the wetland, and exiting downslope (east) and ending near the sRPW was investigated and found to have no OHWM or bed and bank features. It was therefore determined to be an entirely upland feature. It would serve to convey flow from the wetland to the downslope RPW, in addition to overland sheet flow, but is not itself a WOUS.**

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).

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.

- 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: **EPC, Inc..**
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. Concur with findings.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters’ study: **1977 Navigability Survey.**
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: **USGS HA 730-G, 1990 (0305010801).**
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: **1:24,000, Mauldin.**
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: **Map 38 (Cecil).**
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: **Uplands.**
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): **1999/11188:35.**
 - or Other (Name & Date): **Photos submitted by agent 1-28 of 28 with JD Request dated May 7, 2015; Corps site visit photos 1-16 of 16, dated June 25, 2015.**
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): **Site visit June 25, 2015.**

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: This form documents one jurisdictional wetland and two jurisdictional streams as well as a non-jurisdictional upland conveyance. An upland conveyance beginning in the uplands above the wetland (west), entering the wetland, and exiting downslope (east) and ending near the sRPW was investigated and found to have no OHWM or bed and bank features. It was therefore determined to be an entirely upland feature. It would serve to convey flow from the wetland to the downslope RPW, in addition to overland sheet flow, but is not itself a WOUS. The pRPW is depicted on the topographical map as a blue line and on the soils map as a dashed line. This tributary has a strong, continuous OHWM with bed and bank features, strong sediment sorting, a clear line impressed upon the bank, and other features associated with perennial flow. Flow was observed during the site visit and is shown in photos submitted by the agent. The sRPW is a seasonal RPW that is short in length before discharging into the on site pRPW. The sRPW has an OHWM and bed and bank and is expected to flow during wetter months. This tributary provides topographic and hydrologic changes in the landscape that support a variety of wildlife and species diversity through habitat variety. The slower flow would also be expected to allow for increased interactions between the hyporheic zone and the streamwater, further providing functionality for the overall system feeding the downstream TNW. The sRPW is not depicted on the topographical map other than by crenulations in topographical contours indicating a dip in the topography. The sRPW is depicted on the soils map as a dashed line. The drainage area of the sRPW is 30 acres, which is sufficient to provide for relatively permanent flow. This wetland is connected to the sRPW by both overland sheet flow and by a small manmade ditch. This wetland enhances a variety of wildlife species by providing diversity where aquatic systems adjoin uplands. Due to surrounding land uses, this wetland acts as a catch basin for adjacent uplands, filtering sediment and other pollutants and reducing the release of flood waters to the TNW. The chemical pollutants noted by SCDHEC detected in the downstream waters are not sufficiently filtered by the wetlands and will be carried to and affect the TNW. The wetland has the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that supports downstream foodwebs. Per guidance from RGL 07-01, relatively permanent waters are jurisdictional. Since the wetland is adjacent and one of the RPWs is seasonal, a Significant Nexus was performed. Based on documentation provided in Section III.C of this form, the nexus between the sRPW and its adjacent wetland and the downstream TNW is significant. Therefore, the RPWs and wetland documented on this form are waters of the U.S. and jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act.