

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): December 16, 2021

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 2; SAC-2021-01097 Bonnie Brae South

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: located east of the intersection of Ashmore Bridge Road and Fork Shoals Road in Greenville

State: **South Carolina**

County: **Greenville**

City: **Greenville**

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. **34.745684°N**, Long. **82.349360°W**.

Universal Transverse Mercator: **NAD 83**

Name of nearest waterbody: **Reedy River**.

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **0305010904-04 Laurel Creek-Reedy 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: **October 15, 2021**

☒ Field Determination. Date(s): **July 28, 2021**

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: acres.

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

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

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

- ☒ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
Explain: **The 95.64 acre site has 1 isolated wetland. The wetland is 0.03 acres and is located in the center of the site. The wetland is located in a low area of the site with no signs of jurisdictional drainage features, shallow subsurface flow or overland flow off-site or to other waters on-site. The isolated wetland shows no evidence of biological, chemical, or physical connectivity to waters of the U.S. There is also no apparent connection to interstate or foreign commerce. In**

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.

addition, there is no apparent evidence of ecological interconnectivity between the isolated wetland and waters of the U.S. This office has determined that the wetland is isolated from waters of the U.S. and not within the jurisdiction 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: **Pick List**

Drainage area: **Pick List**

Average annual rainfall: inches

Average annual snowfall: inches

(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: .

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: .
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):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by:	<input 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: .

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.

⁷ Ibid.

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)

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: .

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).

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):

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

- ☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: **EPC, Inc.**
☒ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
☒ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. **This office agrees with the conclusions of the submitted data sheets and report.**
☐ Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
☐ Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
☒ Corps navigable waters' study: **1977 Navigability Study.**
☒ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: **HA 730-G, 1990.**
☐ USGS NHD data.
☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. **0305010904-04 Laurel Creek-Reedy River.**
☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: **1:24,000 Simpsonville.**
☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: **SSURGO 2021, Cecil, Cecil-Cataula complex, Hiwassee, Madison.**
☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: **USFWS NWI PUBHh, R4SBC, R5UBH.**
☐ 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 Aerial dated January 28, 2021.**
 or ☒ Other (Name & Date): **Photos 1-19 of 19 provided by USACE dated July 28, 2021; photos 1-41 of 41 taken by the consultant dated March 11-12, 2021.**
☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
☐ Applicable/supporting case law:
☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
☒ Other information (please specify): **Corps Site Visit.**

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The 95.64 acre site has 1 isolated wetland. The wetland is 0.03 acres and is located in the center of the site. The wetland is located in a low area of the site with no signs of jurisdictional drainage features, shallow subsurface flow or overland flow off-site or to other waters on-site. The isolated wetland shows no evidence of biological, chemical, or physical connectivity to waters of the U.S. There is also no apparent connection to interstate or foreign commerce. In addition, there is no apparent evidence of ecological interconnectivity between the isolated wetland and waters of the U.S. This office has determined that the wetland is isolated from waters of the U.S. and not within the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act.

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): December 16, 2021

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 2 of 2; SAC-2021-01097 Bonnie Brae South

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: located east of the intersection of Ashmore Bridge Road and Fork Shoals Road in Greenville

State: **South Carolina**

County: **Greenville**

City: **Greenville**

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. **34.745684°N**, Long. **82.349360°W**.

Universal Transverse Mercator: **NAD 83**

Name of nearest waterbody: **Reedy River**.

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **0305010904-04 Laurel Creek-Reedy 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: **October 15, 2021**

☒ Field Determination. Date(s): **July 28, 2021**

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: **WOUS 1 JT = 221 linear feet, WOUS 5 Impoundment = 0.26 acre, WOUS 6 Impoundment = 0.32 acre, WOUS 7A JT = 792 linear feet, WOUS 7B JT = 804 linear feet, WOUS 7C JT = 706 linear feet, WOUS 9 JT = 416 linear feet, WOUS 10 Impoundment = 0.18 acre, WOUS 11 JT = 333 linear feet, WOUS 15 JT = 202 linear feet**
Wetlands: **WOUS 2 JW = 0.01 acre, WOUS 3 JW = 0.03 acre, WOUS 4 JW = 0.02 acre, WOUS 8 JW = 0.06 acre, WOUS 13 JW = 0.06 acre, WOUS 14 JW = 0.62 acre, WOUS 16 JW = 0.32 acre**

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

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

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

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

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

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

³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. **TNW**

Identify TNW: _____.

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: **Pick List**

Drainage area: **Pick List**

Average annual rainfall: _____ inches

Average annual snowfall: _____ inches

(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: _____.

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

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

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

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

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

Average width: 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):

<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: .

Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

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

⁷Ibid.

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

- ☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- ☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: .
- ☐ Habitat for:
 - ☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
 - ☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
 - ☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
 - ☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

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

(i) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland size: **WOUS 4 JW = 0.02 acre.**

Wetland type. Explain: **Forested.**

Wetland quality. Explain: .

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Ephemeral flow**. Explain: **WOUS 4 JW is directly abutting WOUS 5 Impoundment, an impoundment of WOUS 1 JT, a perennial RPW. WOUS 4 JW flows into WOUS 5 Impoundment during heavy rain and the wetter months.**

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**

Characteristics: .

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

☐ Dye (or other) test performed: .

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

☐ Directly abutting

☒ Not directly abutting

☒ Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: **WOUS 4 JW is directly abutting WOUS 5 Impoundment, an impoundment of WOUS 1 JT, a perennial RPW.**

☐ Ecological connection. Explain: .

☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **30 (or more)** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **30 (or more)** aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

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

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **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: **WOUS 4 JW is located near residential and urban development. Land use/land cover in the watershed includes: 44.5% urban land, 30.3% forested land, 21.2% agricultural land, 2.8% forested wetland (swamp), 0.6% water, and 0.6% barren land.**

Identify specific pollutants, if known: **The wetland is located near residential and urban development. There are possible pollutants from roads, automobiles, and nearby developments.**

(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: **Wetland provides possible breeding grounds for aquatic species.**
 - ☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
 - ☒ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: **Wetland provides habitat for wildlife in the area.**

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

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

Approximately (**0.02**) 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>
WOUS 4 JW: Y	0.02		

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: **The wetland evaluated in this SND is performing biological, chemical, and physical functions that relate to the integrity of the downstream TNW. WOUS 4 Wetland is directly abutting WOUS 5 Impoundment, which was created by the culverts placed in the area for a golf course. A variety of biological functions are being performed by the wetland. The wetland provides possible breeding grounds for aquatic species as well as habitat for wildlife in the area. The chemical functions include nutrient and waste filtration for the surrounding urban and agricultural areas. The physical functions of the wetland include flow maintenance by retaining runoff and storm water during times of heavy rain and during the wetter months.**

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: .

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

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:
☐ TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.
2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
☒ Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: **WOUS 1 JT, WOUS 7A JT, WOUS 7B JT, WOUS 7C JT, WOUS 9 JT, WOUS 11 JT, and WOUS 15 JT are located onsite. WOUS 1 JT, WOUS 7A JT, WOUS 7B JT, and WOUS 7C JT are labeled as blue lines on the topo map and as perennial on the soil survey. WOUS 9 JT, WOUS 11 JT, and WOUS 15 JT are labeled as drainage features on the topo map. The perennial streams had signs of relatively permanent flow that includes a clear OHWM, a distinct channel, bed and bank. The tributaries were observed flowing during flagging and during the Corps site visit**

with flow being continuous throughout the channel. Stream characteristics observed and available data led this office to conclude the tributaries have 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: .

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

☒ Tributary waters: **WOUS 1 JT = 221 linear feet, WOUS 7A JT = 792 linear feet, WOUS 7B JT = 804 linear feet, WOUS 7C JT = 706 linear feet, WOUS 9 JT = 416 linear feet, WOUS 11 JT = 333 linear feet, WOUS 15 JT = 202 linear feet**

☐ 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: **WOUS 2 JW and WOUS 3 JW are directly abutting WOUS 1 JT, a perennial RPW. WOUS 8 JW, WOUS 13 JW, and WOUS 14 JW are directly abutting WOUS 7A JT, a perennial RPW. WOUS 16 JW is directly abutting WOUS 7B JT, a perennial 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: **WOUS 2 JW = 0.01 acre, WOUS 3 JW = 0.03 acre, WOUS 8 JW = 0.06 acre, WOUS 13 JW = 0.06 acre, WOUS 14 JW = 0.62 acre, WOUS 16 JW = 0.32 acre.**

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: **WOUS 4 JW = 0.02 acre.**

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: WOUS 5 Impoundment and WOUS 6 Impoundment are closed boundary polygons that are constructed on jurisdictional water, WOUS 1 JT, a perennial RPW. WOUS 10 Impoundment is a closed boundary polygon that is constructed on jurisdictional water, WOUS 11 JT, a perennial RPW. These ponds have surface and visible connections to downstream waters. The tributaries that the impoundments were built on are jurisdictional waters and thus the impoundments are jurisdictional waters.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

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

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

- ☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: **EPC, Inc.**
- ☒ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
- ☒ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. **This office agrees with the conclusions of the submitted data sheets and report.**
- ☐ Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
- ☒ Corps navigable waters’ study: **1977 Navigability Study.**
- ☒ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: **HA 730-G, 1990.**
- ☐ USGS NHD data.
- ☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. **0305010904-04 Laurel Creek-Reedy River.**
- ☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: **1:24,000 Simpsonville.**
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: **SSURGO 2021, Cecil, Cecil-Cataula complex, Hiwassee, Madison.**
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: **USFWS NWI PUBHh, R4SBC, R5UBH.**
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps:

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.

- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): **Google Earth Aerial dated January 28, 2021.**
or ☒ Other (Name & Date): **Photos 1-19 of 19 provided by USACE dated July 28, 2021; photos 1-41 of 41 taken by the consultant dated March 11-12, 2021.**
- ☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law:
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- ☒ Other information (please specify): **Corps Site Visit.**

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: This JD form documents the jurisdictional status of seven perennial RPWs, three impoundments that were created from waters of the U.S., one wetland indirectly adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs, and six wetlands directly abutting the perennial RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. A Significant Nexus Evaluation was performed for the one wetland indirectly adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs for the record. The one indirectly adjacent to but not directly abutting wetland documented on this form is a water of the U.S. and jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act.