

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Form 1 of 2

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): May 4, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 2; SAC # 2015-01748-2T

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: **Berkeley** City: **Goose Creek**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. **33.062283° N**, Long. **-80.104251° W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: **Laurel Bay/ Goose Creek Reservoir/ Goose Creek**

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **N/A**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **3050201**

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): **10/22/15**

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, 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: **There is one wetland located within the project review area that was determined to be isolated and non-jurisdictional. The wetland is a depressional wetland, is surrounded by uplands, and has no ditches, swales or other linear features coming out of it that would potentially provide a surface hydrologic connection from the wetland to a water of the U.S. In addition, there was no visible signs of discrete flow through the uplands from the isolated wetland to waters of the U.S. There was also no apparent shallow subsurface hydrologic connection, and no apparent physical, chemical, or biological connection, to waters of the U.S. The wetlands also have no apparent ecological interconnectivity to waters of the U.S. For these reasons, Wetland 1 was determined to be isolated and non-jurisdictional and therefore not regulated by Section 404 of 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: **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.

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

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):

Silts Sands Concrete
 Cobbles Gravel Muck
 Bedrock Vegetation. Type/% cover:
 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):

Bed and banks
 OHWM⁶ (check all indicators that apply):
 clear, natural line impressed on the bank the presence of litter and debris
 changes in the character of soil destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 shelving the presence of wrack line
 vegetation matted down, bent, or absent sediment sorting
 leaf litter disturbed or washed away scour
 sediment deposition multiple observed or predicted flow events
 water staining abrupt change in plant community
 other (list):
 Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ Explain:

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

High Tide Line indicated by: Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
 oil or scum line along shore objects survey to available datum;
 fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) physical markings;
 physical markings/characteristics vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.

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

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

⁷Ibid.

- tidal gauges
- other (list):

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

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

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

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: .

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.

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: **Approximately 2** 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.

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: **Sabine and Waters, Inc.**
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Concur with conclusions.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: .
- 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: Lynchburg, Norfolk, Goldsboro
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: PFO1
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): .Berkeley 2006, Google 2014
 - or Other (Name & Date): .
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Wetland 1 was determined to be isolated and not jurisdictional; therefore, it is not regulated by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The jurisdictional status of the sand mining pits, Wetland 2, and the linear conveyance are discussed on Form 2 of 2.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Form 2 of 2

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): May 4, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 2 of 2; SAC # 2015-01748-2T

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: **Berkeley** City: **Goose Creek**
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. **33.062283° N**, Long. **-80.104251° W**.
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: **Laurel Bay/ Goose Creek Reservoir/ Goose Creek**

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: **N/A**

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **3050201**

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): **10/22/15**

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: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: Wetland B: 2.69 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: There is one non-jurisdictional linear feature located within the project review area. The linear feature is approximately 6-8 feet deep and 10 feet wide. The linear feature was full of water at the time of the site visit; however, the site visit was made after approximately 24" of precipitation fell in the area. In addition, it appeared that the water observed within the linear conveyance was being pumped in from the adjacent mining ponds. During a previous site visit for another jurisdictional determination on the same property, the linear conveyance was dry. While the linear conveyance was full of water, it appears to have been excavated from uplands, did not display an OHW mark, or evidence of relatively permanent flow. For these reasons, the linear conveyance was determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA.

Three (3) ponds that are a result of active sand mining activities in uplands are located within the project review area. The mining operations are associated with SCDHEC Mining Permit # 1-001670. As stated in the Preamble to the November 13, 1986, Regulations 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. For these reasons, the three mining ponds were determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA. The non-jurisdictional ponds are shown on the survey plat.

One pond constructed for stormwater purposes is also present within the project review area. The pond appears to have been excavated from uplands for the purposes of stormwater management. It consists of open waters and does not meet the three parameters of a wetland. The pond is associated with SCDHEC NPDES Permit # SCR10F979. For these reasons, the stormwater pond was determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA. The non-jurisdictional pond is shown on the survey plat.

While the linear conveyance and ponds are not jurisdictional, the linear conveyance and several ponds provide a hydrologic connection for Wetland B located within the project review area. The details of the hydrologic connect and the jurisdictional status of the wetland are discussed in Section III of this form.

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

****A portion of the project review area was included in the significant nexus determination for SAC-2014-01294. The tributary discussed in this section was previously discussed and included in the significant nexus determination from SAC-2014-01294. The tributary is located offsite.******

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size: 206,457 acres ;

Drainage area: 1050 acres The drainage area was approximated using topo maps for the purposes of this jurisdictional determination only. Note: The approximate 950 acre drainage area discussed in the previous jurisdictional determination SAC-2014-01294 included a portion of the project review area for the subject jurisdictional determination, SAC-2015-01748. The drainage area for the review of the subject jurisdictional determination was increased by approximately 100 acres to account for the additional uplands and Wetland B that drain through a non-jurisdictional linear conveyance, a series of man-made mining ponds and piped conveyances into the original approximate 950 acre drainage area and Wetland 4 of SAC-2014-01294.

Average annual rainfall: 48 inches

Average annual snowfall: 0 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW.
- Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 5-10 river miles from TNW.
 Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.
 Project waters are 5-10 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: .

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: Wetland B to offsite wetlands to offsite RPW2 to Laurel Bay to Goose Creek Reservoir/ Goose Creek.

Tributary stream order, if known: 1st.

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

- Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain: .
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: The offsite RPW 2 appears to be natural but is likely manipulated along a portion(s) of its length.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate): The tributary channel was not observed as it is located offsite.

Average width: feet
 Average depth: feet
 Average side slopes: Pick List.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply): Although the tributary channel was not observed as it is located offsite, the composition is likely similar to other tributaries in the area potentially consisting of the following.

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

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

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: **The tributary channel was not observed as it is located offsite. Based on aerial photography, the tributary appears to be located within forested wetlands with channel banks that are likely vegetated; therefore, the tributary is likely stable.**

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **Relatively straight.**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): **1 %**

(c) **Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **The tributary channel was not observed as it is located offsite, but it appears as a named blue line tributary (King Branch) on topo maps, has a drainage area of approximately 1050 acres that includes wetlands, and is at a lower elevation than surrounding areas. In addition, this tributary appears to be similar to the RPW 1 discussed on SAC-2014-1294 , Form 2 of 3, that was determined to be perennial. For these reasons, it was concluded that RPW 2 is perennial.**

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

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Confined.** Characteristics:

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

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply): **Although the tributary channel was not observed as it is located offsite, a OHW mark is likely present and similar to other tributaries in the area.**

Bed and banks

OHWM⁶ (check all indicators that apply):

clear, natural line impressed on the bank

changes in the character of soil

shelving

vegetation matted down, bent, or absent

leaf litter disturbed or washed away

sediment deposition

water staining

other (list):

the presence of litter and debris

destruction of terrestrial vegetation

the presence of wrack line

sediment sorting

scour

multiple observed or predicted flow events

abrupt change in plant community

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:

oil or scum line along shore objects

fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)

physical markings/characteristics

tidal gauges

other (list):

Mean High Water Mark indicated by:

survey to available datum;

physical markings;

vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: **The tributary channel was not observed as it is located offsite, but the water quality is likely good to fair as the drainage area and surrounding area are partially developed. Based on aerial photographs, the area surrounding the relevant reach drainage area consists of forested uplands and wetlands, roads, residential subdivisions, small retail/commercial development, and areas under construction.**

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: **The tributary channel likely provides habitat for various aquatic**

organisms including fish, reptiles, amphibians, as well as various birds and mammals .

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.

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: 2.69 acres

Wetland type. Explain: Forested.

Wetland quality. Explain: Good.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: Water flow from Wetland B to the non-jurisdictional linear feature to the non-jurisdictional mining ponds to the offsite wetlands to the offsite RPW 2 is intermittent and may occur seasonally and/or after rain events when surface water in the wetlands is present.

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: Water from Wetland B can flow into the non-jurisdictional linear feature that is located directly adjacent to and at a slightly lower elevation than the wetland. From the non-jurisdictional linear feature, water flows through non-jurisdictional mining ponds 4, then to 5, then to 6, and then to an offsite non-jurisdictional stormwater pond, through a culvert under Highway 17A, into an offsite wetland (Wetland 4) and tributary that were determined to be jurisdictional under SAC-2014-01294. Ultimately, flow from the offsite RPW 2 goes to Laurel Bay and the Goose Creek Reservoir/Goose Creek.

Ecological connection. Explain:

Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are 5-10 river miles from TNW.

Project waters are 5-10 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Flow is from: Wetland to navigable waters.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the Pick List floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: The quality of the wetland appeared to be good. Mining activities are occurring in the uplands near Wetland B..

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: Wetland B likely provides habitat for various species of insects,

amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and birds, all of which may use the wetlands for all or part of their lives, such as for foraging, nesting and/or for shelter.

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 8

Approximately (104.2) 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)

Onsite Wetland B: 2.69 ac N



Offsite 1: 8.2 ac Y

Offsite 2: 40 ac Y

Offsite 3: 30 ac Y

Offsite 4: 8.25 ac N

Offsite 5: 5.7 ac N

Offsite 6: 4.27 ac N

Offsite 7: 5.68 ac N



Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: **The area of this cumulative analysis review includes the onsite Wetland B, which is 2.69 acres in size, and the offsite 102.55 acres of wetlands and approximately 6,000 linear feet of tributary (King Branch). These wetlands within the cumulative analysis review area provide a variety of functions that are important for the downstream waters and the watershed as a whole. The wetlands not only provide habitat for various aquatic and terrestrial organisms, including a variety of insects, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and birds, but are also a source of food, nutrients, and carbon for organisms located downstream. The headwater wetlands are especially important for the water quality of a watershed. Water runoff from adjacent uplands that may contain pollutants, sediments, excess nutrients, etc., that flow through the wetlands before entering the tributaries has the opportunity to be filtered out prior to flowing to downstream TNWs. In addition, excess water can temporarily be stored thereby minimizing potential flooding of downstream areas and can also slowly release water downstream to maintain seasonal flow volumes. Runoff water may also transport organisms, nutrients, and carbon from the wetlands into the tributaries, which continue to flow to downstream TNWs.**

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: **The area of this cumulative analysis review includes the onsite Wetland B, which is 2.69 acres in size, and the**

offsite 102.55 acres of wetlands and approximately 6,000 linear feet of tributary (King Branch). These wetlands within the cumulative analysis review area provide a variety of functions that are important for the downstream waters and the watershed as a whole. The wetlands not only provide habitat for various aquatic and terrestrial organisms, including a variety of insects, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and birds, but are also a source of food, nutrients, and carbon for organisms located downstream. The headwater wetlands are especially important for the water quality of a watershed. Water runoff from adjacent uplands that may contain pollutants, sediments, excess nutrients, etc., that flow through the wetlands before entering the tributaries has the opportunity to be filtered out prior to flowing to downstream TNWs. In addition, excess water can temporarily be stored thereby minimizing potential flooding of downstream areas and can also slowly release water downstream to maintain seasonal flow volumes. Runoff water may also transport organisms, nutrients, and carbon from the wetlands into the tributaries, which continue to flow to downstream TNWs.

The approximate 950 acre drainage area discussed in the previous jurisdictional determination SAC-2014-01294 included a portion of the project review area for the subject jurisdictional determination, SAC-2015-01748. The drainage area for the review of the subject jurisdictional determination was increased by approximately 100 acres to account for the additional uplands and Wetland B that drain through a non-jurisdictional linear conveyance, a series of man-made mining ponds and piped conveyances into the original approximate 950 acre drainage area and Wetland 4 of SAC-2014-01294.

According to the SCDHEC Watershed Assessment information available online, this watershed includes the Town of Moncks Corner, Hanahan, Goose Creek, Ladson, and portions of the City of Charleston, North Charleston and the Town of Summerville. Future growth is expected and is occurring in the watershed. There are eight monitoring stations along the Goose Creek Reservoir and two in Goose Creek. In the Goose Creek Reservoir, recreational activities are fully supported at all of the monitoring sites. For sites RL-04390, 06434, 08065, and 07017, aquatic life uses are partially supported due to dissolved oxygen excursions. At the next downstream station, ST-033, aquatic life uses are not supported due to total phosphorus excursions. Aquatic life uses are fully supported at RL-05412 and 07001. At the furthest downlake station, ST-032, aquatic life uses are not supported due to total phosphorus excursions and there is a significant increasing trend in total phosphorus concentration. The uplands within the project area that is the subject of this jurisdictional determination are currently being mined. This project review area and the approximate 1050 acre drainage area that are being considered in this cumulative analysis are located within an area of Berkeley County that is being developed. All of the approximate 106.89 acres of wetlands considered in this cumulative analysis are likely performing many of the services that wetlands provide; however, when wetlands are filled or altered, the services they provide may be compromised and the loss of those services affects downstream waters and TNWs, including Goose Creek Reservoir/Goose Creek and the Cooper River.

Wetland B within the project review area of the subject jurisdictional determination SAC-2015-01748 has a positive significant nexus to downstream TNWs based on jurisdictional determination SAC-2014-01294 that determined that the wetlands within the review area had a positive significant nexus to downstream TNWs. All of the 104.2 acres of wetlands, including the onsite Wetland B, within the cumulative analysis review area, may provide a source of carbon and nutrients, may provide water quality functions, may store excess water minimizing flooding impacts downstream, can maintain seasonal flow volumes, and may transport organisms, carbon, and nutrients. In addition, the wetlands are likely contributing to the relatively good water quality and integrity of the downstream TNW.

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: **The offsite tributary, RPW 2, appears as a blue line stream on topo maps, is a named stream (King Branch), and has a drainage area of approximately 1050 acres, including approximately 104.2 acres of abutting and non-abutting wetlands. For these reasons, RPW 2 was determined to be 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: **Onsite Wetland B: 2.69** 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).

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.

- 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): _____

There is one non-jurisdictional linear feature located within the project review area. The linear feature is approximately 6-8 feet deep and 10 feet wide. The linear feature was full of water at the time of the site visit; however, the site visit was made after approximately 24" of precipitation fell in the area. In addition, it appeared that the water observed within the linear conveyance was being pumped in from the adjacent mining ponds. During a previous site visit for another jurisdictional determination on the same property, the linear conveyance was dry. While the linear conveyance was full of water, it appears to have been excavated from uplands, did not display an OHW mark, or evidence of relatively permanent flow. For these reasons, the linear conveyance was determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA.

Three (3) ponds that are a result of active sand mining activities in uplands are located within the project review area. The mining operations are associated with SCDHEC Mining Permit # 1-001670. As stated in the Preamble to the November 13, 1986, Regulations 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. For these reasons, the three mining ponds were determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA. The non-jurisdictional ponds are shown on the survey plat.

One pond constructed for stormwater purposes is also present within the project review area. The pond appears to have been excavated from uplands for the purposes of stormwater management. It consists of open waters and does not meet the three parameters of a wetland. The pond is associated with SCDHEC NPDES Permit # SCR10F979. For these reasons, the stormwater pond was determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA. The non-jurisdictional pond is shown on the survey plat.

While the linear conveyance and ponds are not jurisdictional, the linear conveyance and several ponds provide a hydrologic connection for Wetland B located within the project review area. The details of the hydrologic connect and the jurisdictional status of the wetland are discussed in Section III of this form.

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.

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: **Sabine and Waters, Inc.**
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Concur with conclusions.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: _____ .

- Corps navigable waters' study:
- 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: Lynchburg, Norfolk, Goldsboro
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: PFO1
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): .Berkeley 2006, Google 2014
 or Other (Name & Date):
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: SAC-2014-01294
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Wetland B was determined to be jurisdictional and subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA. Five (5) mining and one stormwater pond were determined to be non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA. A linear conveyance was also determined to be non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA. The jurisdictional status of Wetland A is discussed on Form 1 of 2.