

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): **AUG 31 2017**

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: **Charleston District**
SAC-2016-01897_Dunmeyer_Road
Form 1 of 2

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: **Charleston** City: **Ladson**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. **33.0067° N**, Long. **80.1429° W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: **Unnamed tributary system**

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **0305020106/Ashley River**

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: **SAC-2016-01897_Form 2 of 2 recorded waters of the U.S. within the project boundary.**

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

Office (Desk) Determination. Date:

Field Determination. Date(s): **February 16, 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:

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 waters² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
- Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

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

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
Wetlands: **19.97** acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Pick List, Pick List, 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]

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.

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: The features documented on this form include two wetlands (i.e., Isolated Wetland A and B) that were evaluated as potentially jurisdictional pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The site visit identified a 0.33-acre freshwater wetland and a 1.00-acre freshwater wetland within the project boundary that are not subject to the CWA; specifically, the wetlands are palustrine, depression, isolated wetlands located on, and contained within, the south end of the subject parcel. The property is undeveloped and is surrounded by undeveloped parcels, as well as residential development.

The features exhibit no apparent connection/conveyance to waters of the United States; to include no physical, chemical, or biological connections, and no apparent shallow subsurface flow connections to other waters. In addition, the features do not exhibit any apparent ecological interconnectivity with other water features, including any waters of the United States, and there is no apparent connection to interstate or foreign commerce.

On the basis of the aforementioned information, this office has determined that the above-referenced wetland features documented on this form are considered isolated and not subject to the jurisdiction under the CWA.

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:

Drainage area:

Average annual rainfall: inches

Average annual snowfall: inches

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

(ii) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
 Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW.

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

Identify flow route to TNW⁵:

Tributary stream order, if known:

(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: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Explain: | | |

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

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **Pick List**.

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings:

- Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

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.

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

⁷Ibid.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

(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:
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland size: _____ acres

Wetland type. Explain:

Wetland quality. Explain:

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: Pick List. Explain:

Surface flow is: Pick List

Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:

Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

- Directly abutting
- Not directly abutting
 - Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:
 - Ecological connection. Explain:
 - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW.

Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: Pick List.

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:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain:
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List
 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)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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:
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:

Documentation for the Record only: Significant nexus findings for seasonal RPWs and/or wetlands abutting seasonal RPWs:

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
 Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:
 Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow "seasonally" (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:

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

Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).

Other non-wetland waters: acres.

Identify type(s) of waters: .

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

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

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

Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).

Other non-wetland waters: acres.

Identify type(s) of waters: .

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

- Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.

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

Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

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

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

- Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

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

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

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 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.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

¹⁰Prior 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.

Identify type(s) of waters:

Wetlands: acres.

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

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

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

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
- Wetlands: **1.33** 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: Site Location Map, Aerial Map, Soils Map, NWI Map, and Aerials with Data Point Locations submitted by Sabine & Waters, Inc.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Provided by Sabine & Waters.
- Office concurs with the conclusions reached by data sheets/delineation report.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
- Corps navigable waters' study:
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Mapped Soils / Charleston County
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: NWI Map / Charleston County
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth 2015.
or Other (Name & Date): Photos provided by consultant.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify): Sketch entitled "ISOLATED WETLANDS DUNMEYER – LINCOLNVILLE CHARLESTON COUNTY, SC" and dated May 9, 2017.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Based on a site inspection, soil survey data, aerial/site photos, quad/topo sheets, and lidar data, there is a 0.33-acre freshwater wetland and a 1.00-acre freshwater wetland within the project boundary that are not subject to the CWA; specifically, the wetlands are palustrine, depressional, isolated wetlands located on, and contained within, the south end of the subject parcel. The site visit revealed the features are not connected to any navigable water(s) or tributary to navigable water(s); nor is there any connection to interstate or foreign commerce. In addition, the wetlands exhibit no apparent connection/conveyance to waters of the United States; no physical, chemical, biological connections; and no apparent shallow subsurface flow connections to other waters. Furthermore, the wetlands do not exhibit any apparent ecological interconnectivity with other water features, including any waters of the United States. On the basis of this information, this office has determined that the specified wetland features documented on this form are considered isolated and not subject to jurisdiction under the CWA.

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):

AUG 31 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: Charleston District
SAC-2016-01897_Dunmeyer_Road
Form 2 of 2

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: Charleston City: Ladson
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.0067° N, Long. 80.1429° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Chandler Bridge Creek

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 0305020106/Ashley River

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:

Field Determination. Date(s): February 16, 2017

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

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

Explain:

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

TNWs, including territorial seas

Wetlands adjacent to TNWs

Relatively permanent waters² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

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

Impoundments of jurisdictional waters

Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

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

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 18.60 acres total; specifically, Wetland A is 8.68 acres and Wetland D is 9.92 acres.

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

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.

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: SAC-2016-01897 Form 1 of 2 recorded two isolated wetlands (i.e., Isolated Wetland A and B) within the project boundary that were determined not to be subject to the jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Additionally, the site visit documented two borrow pits (i.e., "Non-Jurisdictional Borrow Pit A" and "Non-Jurisdictional Borrow Pit B") within the project boundary.

As stated in the Preamble to the November 13, 1986, Regulation found on page 41217 (Federal Register vol. 51 No. 219) "waterfilled depressions created in dry land incidental to construction activity and pits excavated in dry land for the purpose of obtaining fill, sand, or gravel unless and until the construction or excavation operation is abandoned and resulting body of water meets the definition of waters of the United States" are generally not considered waters of the U.S."

Furthermore, the borrow pits are manmade features excavated wholly within uplands, are not vegetated, and actively receive stormwater from the surrounding uplands. For these reasons, the two borrow pits were also determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

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: 1,545 square miles

Drainage area: 7.14 square miles

Drainage area was approximated for the tributary that was evaluated as part of the Significant Nexus Determination performed for this Jurisdictional Determination. This area was drawn based on apparent flow pathways and drainage areas associated with the subject relevant reach using USGS quadrangle mapping, USGS National Hydrography Dataset mapping, aerial photography, and observations of connectivity and direction of flow made in the field. The intended value of the drainage area map is to document the full collection of

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

wetlands adjacent to the relevant reach and not to assert that the mapping represents more than approximation with respect to actual area.

Average annual rainfall: 51.53 inches
Average annual snowfall: 0 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

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

Project waters are 2.5 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: No.

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Chandler Bridge Creek (a sRPW) flows through the southeastern portion of Wetland D and continues offsite where it flows west and into offsite wetlands that are a part of Wetland A. The sRPW then flows south under the railroad right-of-way and Lincolnville Road where it converges with Eagle Creek and flows to the Ashley River (a TNW).

Tributary stream order, if known:

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

- Tributary is:
- Natural
 - Artificial (man-made). Explain:
 - Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: Portions of the sRPW have been manipulated; however, most of the stream stretch shows sinuous channel.

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

Average width: 3-5 feet
Average depth: 4 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: The portion of the sRPW that transects Wetland D showed signs of turbidity and high erosion.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: None within the portion of the project boundary.

Tributary geometry: Meandering

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

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: Seasonal flow

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

Describe flow regime: Tributary appears to have continuous flow most of the year.

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: Confined. Characteristics: Confined flow with steep banks and channelized in portions.

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
 - changes in the character of soil
 - shelving
 - the presence of litter and debris
 - destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 - the presence of wrack line

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.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinuous OHWM. ⁷ Explain: | |

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

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

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: Tributary was clear with no oily film.

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: Wetland D directly abuts the tributary and Wetland A connects to and is a part of an offsite wetland that directly abuts the tributary.
- Habitat for:
- Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
- Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
- Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
- Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings:

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

(i) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland size: Wetland A: 8.68 acres; Wetland D: 9.92 acres

Wetland type. Explain: PFO1

Wetland quality. Explain: Wetlands have wooded upland buffer and support common FACW and OBL species.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: The adjacent wetlands have a direct hydrologic connection with Chandler Bridge Creek. Water from Chandler Bridge Creek can flow directly into the wetlands and vice versa. Therefore, Wetland A and Wetland D directly abut Chandler Bridge Creek. Topographic maps indicate that Chandler Bridge Creek is a blue-line stream.

Surface flow is: Confined

Characteristics: Confined flow with steep banks and channelized in portions.

Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings:

Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Directly abutting: Both Wetland A and D directly abut the sRPW.

Not directly abutting

Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:

Ecological connection. Explain:

Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are 2-5 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 50-100-year floodplain.

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: Water color was dark with evidence of organics. Surrounding landscape is developed. Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain:
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: Aquatic and wildlife diversity increases with habitat diversity. Forested wetlands have the potential to increase both floral and fauna diversity.

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 2
Approximately (218.60) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

Directly abuts? (Y/N)	Size (in acres)
Wetland A (Y)	8.68
Wetland D (Y)	9.92
Offsite Wetlands	200

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The review area includes Wetland A and D, as well as offsite wetlands, that are adjacent to Chandler Bridge Creek, a sRPW. The braided wetland system either directly abuts or is adjacent to the tributary (which flows through the southeastern portion of Wetland D, then offsite and through wetlands that are a continuous part of Wetland A). The tributary then converges with Eagle Creek which then flows directly to the Ashley River and into the Atlantic Ocean.

These similarly situated forested palustrine wetlands that are directly abutting the sRPW documented on this form are collectively performing functions consistent with the following: Biological – wetlands adjacent to the sRPW include palustrine forested wetlands. As such, a broad variety of biological functions are being performed which include providing breeding grounds and shelter for aquatic species, foraging areas for wetland dependent species, and in particular, floodplain wetlands provide important spawning areas for species that inhabit the area as adults. These wetlands are essential in providing organic carbon in the form of their collective primary productivity to downstream waters, resulting in the nourishment of the downstream food web. Chemical – Wetlands in the review area are providing the important collective functions of removal of excess nutrients which are contributed by runoff from the surrounding uplands and developed areas, reducing nitrogen and phosphorus loading downstream, and effectively preventing oxygen depletion that can result from eutrophication. Physical – Wetlands in the review area are collectively performing flow maintenance functions, including retaining runoff inflow and storing flood water temporarily. Flow maintenance results in the reduction of downstream peak flows (discharge and volume), helping to maintain seasonal flow volumes.

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:

Documentation for the Record only: Significant nexus findings for seasonal RPWs and/or wetlands abutting seasonal RPWs:

The site visit documented two wetlands (i.e., Wetland A and D) that are subject to jurisdiction under the CWA. The two wetlands each are a part of an offsite braided wetland system. The offsite wetland systems are located to the east, south, and west of the review area and directly abut Chandler Bridge Creek (a sRPW). Topographic maps indicate the tributary is a blue-line stream. The sRPW flows through the southeastern portion of Wetland D and continues offsite where it flows west and into offsite wetlands that are a continuous part of Wetland A. The sRPW then flows south under the railroad right-of-way and Lincolnville Road. It then converges with Eagle Creek and flows directly to the Ashley River (a TNW).

The project boundary is encompassed by residential development and there is an overall high potential for growth in this watershed. Aquatic life uses in Chandler Bridge Creek are not supported due to ammonia excursions. In addition, there is a significant increasing trend in total phosphorus concentration. There is a significant increasing trend in pH. Significant decreasing trends in five-day biological oxygen demand and total nitrogen concentration suggest improving conditions for these parameters. Recreational uses are not supported due to fecal coliform bacteria excursions. However, the tributary does provide drainage for approximately 200 acres of adjacent wetlands within the review area. As a result, sufficient water is available to support flow-dependent aquatic life, including fish and gill-breathing amphibians, benthic insects, crustaceans, and mollusks, many of which survive in shallow hyporheic flow beneath rocks or logs. The tributary consists of a sinuous channel that exhibits physical and hydrological characteristics commonly associated with normal flow including discernible bank and streambed, vegetation, leaf litter, and debris that may provide habitat. Larger wildlife such as mammals and wading birds may also utilize the tributary as a food and water source; as well as a corridor for movement of aquatic organisms.

Furthermore, the tributary and the associated onsite and offsite wetlands not only provide habitat for various aquatic and terrestrial organisms, but are also a source of food, nutrients, and carbon for organisms located downstream to the TNW; which are especially important for the water quality of the watershed. Water runoff from adjacent uplands containing pollutants, sediments, excess nutrients, etc., flows through the wetlands before entering the tributary, which are filtered out/removed prior to flowing to the downstream TNW. In addition, excess water can temporarily be stored; thereby, minimizing potential flooding of surrounding upland areas and can also slowly release water to maintain seasonal flow volumes. Runoff water may also transport organisms, nutrients, and carbon from the wetlands into the tributary; which continue to flow to the downstream TNW. Small tributaries often have shallow water, low volume, and slow flow; which allows for more surface area of the water column to come into contact with channel substrate and any vegetation that may be present; thereby, allowing for sediments and pollutants to settle out of or be filtered from the water column before flowing to the downstream to the Ashley River.

There are five monitoring stations along the Ashley River. At the furthest upstream site (CSTL-102), aquatic life uses are fully supported for both fresh and saltwater classifications; however, there is a significant increasing trend in total phosphorus concentration for both classifications. Although dissolved oxygen excursions occurred, they were typical of values seen in such systems and were considered natural, not standard violations. There is a significant increasing trend in pH. A significant decreasing trend in total nitrogen concentration suggests improving conditions for this parameter. Recreational uses are partially supported due to fecal coliform bacteria excursions for both classifications. Moving downstream to MD-049, aquatic life uses are not supported due to turbidity and dissolved oxygen excursions. Significant decreasing trends in turbidity, total nitrogen concentration, and fecal coliform bacteria concentration suggest improving conditions for these parameters. Recreational uses are partially supported due to fecal coliform bacteria excursions at this site. Further downstream (MD-135), both aquatic life and recreational uses are fully supported. Significant increasing trends in dissolved oxygen concentration and decreasing trends in total phosphorus concentration suggest improving conditions for these parameters.

Continuing downstream to MD-052, aquatic life uses are not supported due to occurrences of copper in excess of the aquatic life criterion and dissolved oxygen excursions. In addition, there is a significant increasing trend in five-day biological oxygen demand. There is a significant decreasing trend in pH. Significant increasing trends in dissolved oxygen concentration and decreasing trends in turbidity, total nitrogen concentration, and fecal coliform bacteria suggest improving conditions for these parameters. Recreational uses are fully supported at this site. At the furthest downstream site (MD-034), aquatic life and

recreational uses are fully supported. Significant decreasing trends in five-day biological oxygen demand, total phosphorus and total nitrogen concentration, and fecal coliform bacteria suggest improving conditions for these parameters.

Based on the collective functions described above and their importance to the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the navigable waters of the Ashley River, this office has determined that there is a Significant Nexus between the review area Relevant Reach and its adjacent wetlands and 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:
- 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: Chandler Bridge Creek is a sRPW that converges with Eagle Creek to flow to the Ashley River. Topographic maps indicate that Chandler Bridge Creek is a blue-line stream. The stream flow path can clearly be observed on aerial imagery. This sRPW consists of a sinuous channel that was bank-full at the time of the site visit. This tributary exhibits physical and hydrological characteristics commonly associated with normal flow including discernible bank and streambed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
 Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: The review area includes Wetland A and D which abut Chandler Bridge Creek, a sRPW; specifically, the wetlands directly abut the tributary (which flows through the southeastern portion of Wetland D, then offsite and through wetlands that are a continuous part of Wetland A).

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 18.60 acres.

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

- Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

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

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

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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: _____
- 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): Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. The site visit documented two borrow pits (i.e., "Non-Jurisdictional Borrow Pit A" and "Non-Jurisdictional Borrow Pit B") within the project boundary. As stated in the Preamble to the November 13, 1986, Regulation found on page 41217 (Federal Register vol. 51 No. 219) "waterfilled depressions created in dry land incidental to construction activity and pits excavated in dry land for the purpose of obtaining fill, sand, or gravel unless and until the construction or excavation operation is abandoned and resulting body of water meets the definition of waters of the United States" are generally not considered waters of the U.S." Furthermore, the borrow pits are manmade features excavated wholly within uplands, are not vegetated, and actively receive stormwater from the surrounding uplands. For these reasons, the two borrow pits were also determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

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

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

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

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): _____ linear feet, _____ width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: _____ acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: _____ acre. 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):

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.

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Site Location Map, Aerial Map, Soils Map, NWI Map, and Aerials with Data Point Locations submitted by Sabine & Waters, Inc.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Provided by Sabine & Waters.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. Concurs with conclusions.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
- Corps navigable waters' study:
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Mapped Soils / Charleston County
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: NWI Map / Charleston County
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth 2015.
or Other (Name & Date): Photos provided by consultant.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify): Associated plat, sheets 1 thru 2 of 2, entitled "LINCILNVILLE TRACT LOCATED NEAR THE TOWN OF LINCOLNVILLE CHARLESTON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA" and dated March 14, 2017.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Based on a site inspection, soil survey data, aerial/site photos, quad/topo sheets, and lidar data, there is a 0.16-acre borrow pit and a 0.62-acre freshwater borrow pit within the project boundary that are not subject to the CWA; specifically, the borrow pits are manmade features excavated wholly within uplands. The features are not vegetated, only receive/retain water as a result of storm-related events, and do not meet the 3-parameters per the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual. On the basis of this information, this office has determined that the specified borrow pit features documented on this form are not subject to jurisdiction under the CWA.

On the basis of this information, this office has determined that Wetland A and D, as documented on this form, are subject to jurisdiction under the CWA.