SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): April 26, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 3; SAC 2015-00854 Cameron Solar Site

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina   County/parish/borough: Calhoun   City: Cameron
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.5755° N, Long. -80.7091° W
   Universal Transverse Mercator:
   Name of nearest waterbody: Four Hole Swamp
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Four Hole Swamp
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 0305020501 Upper Four Hole Swamp
   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): August 12, 2015

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
   Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
   Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. Explain: .

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There are “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

   1. Waters of the U.S.
      a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): 1
         - TNWs, including territorial seas
         - Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
         - Relatively permanent waters\(^2\) (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         - Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         - Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         - Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         - Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
         - Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
         - Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands
      b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:
         Non-wetland waters: Tributary 1= 125 linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
         Wetlands: Wetland 1= 3.95 acres; Wetland 2= 6.10 acres; Wetland 3= 0.60 acre; Wetland 6= 3.0 acres Total= 13.65 acres.
      c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual, Established by OHWM.
         Elevation of established OHWM (if known):.

   2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): \(^3\) [Including potentially jurisdictional features that upon assessment are NOT waters or wetlands]
      - Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
      Explain: 

---
\(^1\) 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 waterbody is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW
   (i) General Area Conditions:
      Watershed size: 167,561 acres;
      Drainage area: 18 acres
      Average annual rainfall: 51 inches
      Average annual snowfall: 0 inches
   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
      (a) Relationship with TNW:
         [ ] Tributary flows directly into TNW.
         [x] 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 2-5 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
         Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
         Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .
      Identify flow route to TNW: Wetland 6 flows into an unnamed sRPW (Tributary 1) which flows into Cook Branch.
      Cook Branch flows directly into Four Hole Swamp, the downstream TNW.

---

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: The feature has been straightened and excavated to carry more water from the site into an offsite linear feature which drains to Cook Branch.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
Average width: 2-3 feet  
Average depth: 1-2 feet  
Average side slopes: 2:1.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
☒ Silts  ☒ Sands  ☐ Concrete  
☐ Cobbles  ☐ Gravel  ☐ Muck  
☐ Bedrock  ☐ Vegetation. Type/% cover:  
☐ Other. Explain:  

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: The tributary had relatively stable banks with no evidence of erosion or sloughing.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: No run/riffle/pool complexes observed.

Tributary geometry: Relatively straight. A review of aerial photographs, topographic maps, and information obtained during the site visit determined that this tributary flows between agricultural fields until it reaches Cook Branch.

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 0-1 %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: Seasonal flow

Describe flow regime: The tributary provides seasonal flow based on a review of aerials, topographic maps, and information obtained during the site visit. During the site visit, the tributary was observed as having flowing water. The amount of leaf litter and debris in the channel could not be seen due to the amount of water present.

Other information on duration and volume: This area had previously had a large rain event including flooding after Hurricane Joaquin.

Surface flow is: Discrete and confined. Characteristics: Surface flow is restricted under normal conditions between the bed and bank of the tributary.

Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings:
☐ Dye (or other) test performed:  

Tributary has (check all that apply):
☒ Bed and banks  
☒ OHWM* (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):  

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  
☐ fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)  
☐ physical markings/characteristics  
☐ tidal gauges  
☐ other (list):  

---

*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.
(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Explain: During the site visit, the tributary was observed to have cloudy flowing water present; no oily film was observed. Land use in this watershed is comprised of 47.9% agricultural land, 28.1% forested land, 15.5% forested wetland (swamp), 8.1% urban land, 0.2% water, and 0.2% nonforested wetland (marsh).
Identify specific pollutants, if known: Because a large portion of the watershed is comprised of agricultural land, the potential exists for herbicides and other pesticides, as well as runoff from land disturbing activities such as plowing and harvesting, to enter the on-site tributary. Because agricultural lands require regular manipulation of the soils, agricultural activities can create an increase in suspended sediments in the downstream tributaries.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
☒ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): This tributary is a 1st order sRPW that supports a riparian zone that contributes to the health of the aquatic system by filtering out pollutants and preventing erosion.
☒ 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 provides important aquatic habitat for wildlife and a travel corridor for aquatic fauna.

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:
(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties: Wetland #6
Wetland size: 3 acres
Wetland type. Explain: Palustrine forested.
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: The wetland flows into the onsite sRPW after major storm events and other periods of high rainfall.

Surface flow is: Discrete and confined
Characteristics: Wetland 6 flow into the sRPW which then flows into a series of non-jurisdictional ditches offsite that flow directly into Cook Branch.

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: .
☐ Ecological connection. Explain: .
☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are 25-30 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 100 - 500-year floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: The wetlands onsite were inundated during the time of the site visit. Land use in this watershed is comprised of 47.9% agricultural land, 28.1% forested land, 15.5% forested wetland (swamp), 8.1% urban land, 0.2% water, and 0.2% nonforested wetland (marsh).
According to the SCDHEC Website, there is a low to moderate potential for growth in this watershed, which contains the Towns of Cameron and Bowman, and portions of the City of Orangeburg and the Town of Elloree.
Identify specific pollutants, if known: Because a large portion of the watershed is comprised of agricultural land, the potential exists for herbicides and other pesticides, as well as runoff from land disturbing activities such as plowing and harvesting, to enter the on-site wetlands. Because this land use requires regular manipulation of the soils, agricultural activities can create an increase in suspended sediments in the downstream tributaries. There are two SCDHEC monitoring stations along this section of Four Hole Swamp. This is a blackwater system, characterized by naturally low dissolved oxygen concentrations. In the upper reach,
aquatic life uses are fully supported; however, there is a significant increasing trend in five-day biochemical oxygen demand. Significant decreasing trends in turbidity and total nitrogen concentration suggest improving conditions for these parameters. Recreational uses are not supported due to fecal coliform bacteria excursions.

(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: 5
   Approximately (22) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
   For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:
The seasonal RPW and adjacent wetlands are providing important biological, chemical, and physical functions. According to the SCDHEC Watersheds website, the wetlands onsite were inundated during the time of the site visit. Land use in this watershed is comprised of 47.9% agricultural land, 28.1% forested land, 15.5% forested wetland (swamp), 8.1% urban land, 0.2% water, and 0.2% nonforested wetland (marsh). According to the SCDHEC Website, there is a low to moderate potential for growth in this watershed, which contains the Towns of Cameron and Bowman, and portions of the City of Orangeburg and the Town of Elloree. Due to the predominance of agricultural land use in this watershed and in the drainage area, herbicides and other pollutants are likely to enter the tributary and downstream TNW. The 1st order tributary and adjacent wetlands act as a catch basin to help filter out pollutants from the neighboring uplands and to hold runoff prior to it flowing downstream into the TNW. Besides the obvious functions of stormwater attenuation, absorption, and overstory biomass input into the food web, the seasonal RPW and its adjacent wetlands provide a uniquely important ecological connection to the downstream TNW. Therefore, the unnamed tributary to Cook Branch, Cook Branch and its adjacent wetlands have a significant nexus to the downstream TNW.

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?
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:

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

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:

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

3. **Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:

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

The on-site seasonal RPW and its adjacent wetlands are performing important biological, chemical, and physical functions within a watershed comprised primarily of agricultural land use. The biological functions being performed include providing breeding grounds and shelter for aquatic animals and diversifying the plant life within the watershed. As a result, the waters of the US in the drainage area supply food sources for a variety of water dependent species, such as invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles and mammals. This tributary is essential in providing organic carbons in the form of their collective primary productivity to downstream waters, resulting in the nourishment of the downstream food web. The chemical functions being performed consist of the removal of excess pollutants, which are contributed by runoff from the surrounding uplands, from the downstream TNW. This reduces nitrogen and phosphorus loading downstream and effectively prevents oxygen depletion that can result from eutrophication. Physically, the tributary and adjacent wetlands help reduce stormwater flow. Not only does this prevent the accumulation of sediment downstream, which can smother fish and other aquatic wildlife, but it also reduces the amount of pollutants downstream because these pollutants are usually transported by sediment particles. This seasonal RPW and the adjacent wetlands temporarily store flood waters and reduce downstream peak flows. This helps to maintain seasonal flow volumes. Based on the collective functions described above and their importance to the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the traditional navigable waters of Four Hole Swamp, it has been determined that there is a significant nexus between the relevant reach of the unnamed seasonal RPW and its adjacent wetlands, to Cook Branch and the downstream TNW.

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

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:
   - [ ] TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
   - [ ] Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - [ ] Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:

     - Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
       - Wetland 6 flows into the onsite sRPW (Tributary 1) after major storm events and other periods of high rainfall.

     Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
       - [ ] Tributary waters: 125 linear feet width (ft).
       - [ ] Other non-wetland waters: acres.
       - Identify type(s) of waters:

3. **Non-RPWs** 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.**

---

8See Footnote # 3.
Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.

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

- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow “seasonally.” Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: The wetland flows into the onsite sRPW after major storm events and other periods of high rainfall.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 13.65 acres.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.9

As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

- Demonstrate that impoundment was created from “waters of the U.S.,” or
- Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
- Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

Explain:

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

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- 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):

---

9 To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
10 Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.
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: Maps prepared by consultant; Wes Fryar of Land Management Groups, Inc.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. This office generally concurs with the overall conclusions presented on the data sheets prepared by the consultant.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters’ study: .
- USGS NHD data: .
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps: .
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Cameron Quadrangle 7.5.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS NWI Map.
- 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 Imagery and aerial imagery provided by consultant.
- 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: Based on a review of aerial photography, topographic maps, NWI and soils maps, and as confirmed by a site visit, Wetlands 1, 2, and 3 directly abut Cook Branch, a perennial tributary to Four Hole Swamp and on this basis are jurisdictional by definition. It was also determined that Wetland 6 drains into an adjacent unnamed seasonal tributary onsite, Tributary 1, which flows offsite through a series of linear features into Cook Branch. Cook Branch flows directly into Four Hole Swamp, the downstream TNW. This information is in support of a significant nexus as documented on this form.
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): April 26, 2016

B. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   - State: South Carolina
   - County/parish/borough: Calhoun
   - City: Cameron
   - Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.5755° N, Long. -80.7091° W
   - Universal Transverse Mercator:
   - Name of nearest waterbody: Four Hole Swamp
   - Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Four Hole Swamp
   - Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 0305020501 Upper Four Hole Swamp
   - 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): August 12, 2015

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   - There are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
   - Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
   - Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. Explain:

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   - There are “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

   1. Waters of the U.S.
   a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):  
      - TNWs, including territorial seas
      - Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      - Relatively permanent waters (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 4 = 0.17 acre; Wetland 5 = 5.2 acres; Wetland 7 = 0.45 acre; Total = 5.82 acres.
   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual, Pick List
      - Elevation of established OHWM (if known):
      -

   2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): Including potentially jurisdictional features that upon assessment are NOT waters or wetlands
      - Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain:

---

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 the characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under Rapanos have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are “relatively permanent waters” (RPWs), i.e., tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant nexus evaluation. Corps districts and EPA regions will include in the record any available information that documents the existence of a significant nexus between a relatively permanent tributary that is not perennial (and its adjacent wetlands if any) and a traditional navigable water, even though a significant nexus finding is not required as a matter of law.

If the waterbody is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW
   (i) General Area Conditions:
      Watershed size: 167,561 acres;
      Drainage area: 650 acres
      Average annual rainfall: 51 inches
      Average annual snowfall: 0 inches
   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
      (a) Relationship with TNW:
         - Tributary flows directly into TNW.
         - Tributary flows through 3 tributaries before entering TNW.
         Project waters are 2-5 river miles from TNW.
         Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.
         Project waters are 1-2 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 TNW: Wetland 4 directly abuts a perennial RPW at a point just offsite. This RPW flows directly into the larger offsite/onsite wetland system which includes Wetland 5 and ultimately connects to Four Hole Swamp, the downstream

---

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.
TNW. Wetland 7 is a depressional wetland adjacent to the same relevant reach, but is not directly abutting. Wetland 7 is separated by a small upland berm, however the gradient of the landscape would allow for downward flow from the Wetland 7 to the relevant reach.

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

- **Tributary is:**
  - Natural
  - Artificial (man-made). Explain:
  - Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: The feature flows through an area that has a history of agriculture. Areas of the tributary have been straightened and excavated to carry more water. The wetlands system and the tributary drain to Four Hole Swamp. The tributary was located outside of the property boundaries and therefore was not observed in the field. The following is based on interpretation from aerial imagery.

  **Tributary** properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
  - Average width: 2-3 feet
  - Average depth: 1-2 feet
  - Average side slopes: 3:1.

  Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
  - Silts
  - Sands
  - Concrete
  - Cobbles
  - Gravel
  - Muck
  - Bedrock
  - Vegetation. Type/cover:
  - Other. Explain: Unknown; The tributary was located outside of the property boundaries and therefore was not observed in the field.

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

  Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: The tributary was located outside of the property boundaries and therefore was not observed in the field.

  **Tributary geometry:** Meandering. A review of aerial photographs, topographic maps, and information obtained during the site visit determined that this tributary flows between agricultural fields until it reaches Four Hole Swamp.

  Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): 0-1 %

(c) Flow:

- **Tributary provides for:** Perennial flow

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

  Describe flow regime: The tributary provides perennial flow based on a review of aerials, topographic, and NWI maps.

  Other information on duration and volume: This area had previously had a large rain event including flooding after Hurricane Joaquin.

  Surface flow is: Discrete and confined. Characteristics: Based on aerial imagery, it appears that surface flow is restricted under normal conditions between the bed and bank of the tributary.

  Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings:

  Dye (or other) test performed: .

  Tributary has (check all that apply):
  - Bed and banks
  - OHWM\(^6\) (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):
      - Discontinuous OHWM.\(^7\) Explain: Based on a review of aerial imagery, it appears that the bed and bank of the tributary may dissipate in some areas, including where the tributary enters and exists Wetland 5.

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;

---

\(^6\)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.
(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Explain: The tributary was located outside of the property boundaries and therefore was not observed in the field. Land use in this watershed is comprised of 47.9% agricultural land, 28.1% forested land, 15.5% forested wetland (swamp), 8.1% urban land, 0.2% water, and 0.2% nonforested wetland (marsh).

Identify specific pollutants, if known: Because a large portion of the watershed is comprised of agricultural land, the potential exists for herbicides and other pesticides, as well as runoff from land disturbing activities such as plowing and harvesting, to enter the on-site tributary. Because agricultural lands require regular manipulation of the soils, agricultural activities can create an increase in suspended sediments in the downstream tributaries.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): This tributary is a 1st order pRPW that supports a riparian zone that contributes to the health of the aquatic system by filtering out pollutants and preventing erosion.
- 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 provides important aquatic habitat for wildlife and a travel corridor for aquatic fauna.

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

(i) Physical Characteristics:
(a) General Wetland Characteristics:
Properties:
- Wetland size: 0.45 acres
- Wetland type. Explain: Palustrine forested.
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: The wetland flows offsite into a larger wetland system after major storm events and other periods of high rainfall.

Surface flow is: Overland sheetflow
Characteristics: Wetland 7 flows offsite into a larger wetland system which directly abuts a perennial RPW that flows directly into Four Hole Swamp. 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: .
  - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are 1-2 river miles from TNW.
Project waters are 1-2 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: Wetland to navigable waters.
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the 100 - 500-year floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: The wetlands onsite were inundated during the time of the site visit. Land use in this watershed is comprised of 47.9% agricultural land, 28.1% forested land, 15.5% forested wetland (swamp), 8.1% urban land, 0.2% water, and 0.2% nonforested wetland (marsh). According to the SCDHEC Website, there is a low to moderate potential for growth in this watershed, which contains the Towns of Cameron and Bowman, and portions of the City of Orangeburg and the Town of Elloree.
Identify specific pollutants, if known: Because a large portion of the watershed is comprised of agricultural land, the potential exists for herbicides and other pesticides, as well as runoff from land disturbing activities such as plowing and harvesting, to enter the on-site wetlands. Because this land use requires regular manipulation of the soils, agricultural activities can create an increase in suspended sediments in the downstream tributaries.

There are two SCDHEC monitoring stations along this section of Four Hole Swamp. This is a blackwater system, characterized by naturally low dissolved oxygen concentrations. In the upper reach, aquatic life uses are fully supported; however, there is a significant increasing trend in five-day biochemical oxygen demand. Significant decreasing trends in turbidity and total nitrogen concentration suggest improving conditions for these parameters. Recreational uses are not supported due to fecal coliform bacteria excursions.

(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: The wetlands provide important aquatic habitat for wildlife and a travel corridor for aquatic fauna.

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 5
Approximately (92) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:
The perennial RPW and adjacent wetlands are providing important biological, chemical, and physical functions. According to the SCDHEC Watersheds website, the wetlands onsite were inundated during the time of the site visit. Land use in this watershed is comprised of 47.9% agricultural land, 28.1% forested land, 15.5% forested wetland (swamp), 8.1% urban land, 0.2% water, and 0.2% nonforested wetland (marsh). According to the SCDHEC Website, there is a low to moderate potential for growth in this watershed, which contains the Towns of Cameron and Bowman, and portions of the City of Orangeburg and the Town of Elloree. Due to the predominance of agricultural land use in this watershed and in the drainage area, herbicides and other pollutants are likely to enter the tributary and downstream TNW. The 1st order tributary and adjacent wetlands act as a catch basin to help filter out pollutants from the neighboring uplands and to hold runoff prior to it flowing downstream into the TNW. Besides the obvious functions of stormwater attenuation, absorption, and overstory biomass input into the food web, the perennial RPW and its adjacent wetlands provide an important ecological connection to the downstream TNW. Therefore, the unnamed tributary to Four Hole Swamp and its adjacent wetlands have a significant nexus to the downstream TNW.

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: 

---

Wetland 7 is a depressional wetland adjacent to the larger wetland system; it does not directly abut the system. Wetland 7 is separated by a small upland berm, however the gradient of the landscape would allow for downward flow from the wetland 7 to the offsite wetland system. This system was not observed in the field, however based on a review of the USGS Topography maps, NWI maps, and aerial photography, it directly abuts a perennial RPW which flows directly into Four Hole Swamp, the downstream TNW.

---

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

The on-site seasonal RPW and its adjacent wetlands are performing important biological, chemical, and physical functions within a watershed comprised primarily of agricultural land use. The biological functions being performed include providing breeding grounds and shelter for aquatic animals and diversifying the plant life within the watershed. As a result, the waters of the US in the drainage area supply food sources for a variety of water dependent species, such as invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles and mammals. This tributary is essential in providing organic carbons in the form of their collective primary productivity to downstream waters, resulting in the nourishment of the downstream food web. The chemical functions being performed consist of the removal of excess pollutants, which are contributed by runoff from the surrounding uplands, from the downstream TNW. This reduces nitrogen and phosphorus loading downstream and effectively prevents oxygen depletion that can result from eutrophication. Physically, the tributary and adjacent wetlands help reduce stormwater flow. Not only does this prevent the accumulation of sediment downstream, which can smother fish and other aquatic wildlife, but it also reduces the amount of pollutants downstream because these pollutants are usually transported by sediment particles. This seasonal RPW and the adjacent wetlands temporarily store flood waters and reduce downstream peak flows. This helps to maintain seasonal flow volumes. Based on the collective functions described above and their importance to the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the traditional navigable waters of Four Hole Swamp, it has been determined that there is a significant nexus between the relevant reach of the unnamed seasonal RPW and its adjacent wetlands, to Cook Branch and the downstream TNW.

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

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:
   - [ ] TNWs: linear feet width (ft), Or, acres.
   - [ ] Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - [ ] Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial:
   - [ ] Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
     - 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-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

---

8See Footnote # 3.
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 abutting an 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: Based on a review of aerial photography, topographic maps, NWI and soil surveys, as well as a site visit, it was determined that Wetland 4 and Wetland 5 directly abut a perennial RPW which located just offsite. Although this feature was located offsite, it was visible from the site and was determined to be perennial due to observed flow characteristics during the time of the site visit. A clear OHWM was observed on the bank, a firm sandy bottom was observed in the channel, leaf litter was washed away and vegetation was matted down in the channel. Additionally, the water present in the channel was flowing freely.

- 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: 5.37 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. Wetland 7 is a depressional wetland adjacent to but not directly abutting the perennial RPW. Wetland 7 is separated by a small upland berm, however the gradient of the landscape would allow for down slope flow from Wetland 7.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 0.45 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).

9 To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
10 Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.
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 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: Maps prepared by consultant; Wes Fryar of Land Management Groups, Inc.

☒ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Office concur with data sheets/delineation report. This office generally concurs with the overall conclusions presented on the data sheets prepared by the consultant.

☐ 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: Cameron Quadrangle 7.5.

☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.

☐ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS NWI Map.

☐ 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 Imagery and aerial imagery provided by consultant.

☐ 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: This form documents the jurisdictional status of 3 wetlands adjacent to an offsite RPW. Wetlands 4 and 5 directly abut the perennial RPW and are jurisdictional by definition. Wetland 7 is adjacent to, but not directly abutting the perennial RPW. Therefore a significant nexus determination was performed which documents the jurisdictional of the perennial RPW and all of its adjacent wetlands, including Wetland 7.
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): April 26, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 3 of 3; SAC 2015-00854 Cameron Solar Site

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina  County/parish/borough: Calhoun  City: Cameron

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.5755° N, Long. -80.7091° W

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Four Hole Swamp

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Four Hole Swamp

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 0305020501 Upper Four Hole Swamp

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: [Blank]
- Field Determination. Date(s): August 12, 2015

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

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

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There are no “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.

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

      - TNWs, including territorial seas
      - Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      - Relatively permanent waters (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: [Blank]

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

      - Elevation of established OHWM (if known): [Blank]

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 are two wetlands which have been determined to be isolated and non-jurisdictional: Isolated Wetland 1 (.7 acre) and Isolated Wetland 2 (.3 acre). Both features were determined to be depression wetland pockets surrounded completely by uplands and positioned lower in the landscape than the surrounding uplands. There were no ditches, swales, or other linear features which would allow the conveyance of flow from the wetlands to the downstream TNW. No visible surface hydrologic connections between wetlands and waters of the U.S. appear to be present. In addition, there are no apparent shallow subsurface hydrologic connections, and no apparent physical chemical, or biological connections to waters of the U.S. The wetlands also have no apparent ecological interconnection to waters of the U.S. For these reasons, Isolated Wetland 1 and Isolated Wetland 2 were 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 waterbody 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.

---

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

Tributary stream order, if known: .

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

Tributary is:  
- Natural  

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  
- Cobble  
- Gravel  
- Muck  
- Bedrock  
- Vegetation. Type/percent cover: .
- Other. Explain: .

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


Tributary geometry: Pick List. Explain: .

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: .


Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings: .
- Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):
- Bed and banks
- OHWM* (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): .
- 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  
- Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
  - survey to available datum;  
  - physical markings;  
  - 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-RPWs\(^8\) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
- Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):
- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
Identify type(s) of waters:

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: .

\(^8\)See Footnote # 3.
\(^9\) To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
\(^10\) Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.
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: Isolated Wetland 1: 0.7 acre; Isolated Wetland 2: 0.3 acre; Total: 1.0 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: Maps prepared by consultant; Wes Fryar of Land Management Groups, Inc.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
- Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. This office generally concurs with the information presented on the data sheets prepared by the consultant.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: ____________________________ .
- Corps navigable waters’ study: ____________________________ .
- USGS NHD data: ____________________________ .
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps: ____________________________ .
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Cameron Quadrangle 7.5.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Web Soil Survey.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS NWI Map.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): ____________________________ .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: ____________________________ .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: ____________________________ . (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google Earth Imagery and aerial imagery provided by consultant.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: ____________________________ .
- Applicable/supporting case law: ____________________________ .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: ____________________________ .
- Other information (please specify): ____________________________ .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:
There are two wetlands which have been determined to be isolated and non-jurisdictional: Isolated Wetland 1 (.7 acre) and Isolated Wetland 2 (.3 acre). Both features were determined to be depressional wetland pockets surrounded completely by uplands and
positioned lower in the landscape than the surrounding uplands. There were no ditches, swales, or other linear features which would allow the conveyance of flow from the wetlands to the downstream TNW. No visible surface hydrologic connections between wetlands and waters of the U.S. appear to be present. In addition, there are no apparent shallow subsurface hydrologic connections, and no apparent physical chemical, or biological connections to waters of the U.S. The wetlands also have no apparent ecological interconnection to waters of the U.S. For these reasons, Isolated Wetland 1 and Isolated Wetland 2 were determined to be isolated and non-jurisdictional and therefore not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA.
Cameron Solar Total Project Area = ~ 185 Acres

- Areas considered to be uplands ~ 165.5 ac or 90%
- Flagged wetlands ~ 19.5 ac or 10%
- Flagged areas considered to be isolated wetlands ~ 1 ac or <1%

Seasonal Relatively Permanent Water (sRPW-Tributary) as regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ~ 125-linear feet (area outside of wetland boundary)

Non-Jurisdictional / Non-RPW - Areas considered to be ephemeral channel

Geo-referenced Photo Stations

USACE Data Sheet Locations

NOTE: This is not a survey. All boundaries and distances are considered approximate. This sketch graphically depicts results from an on-site meeting with the USACE on August 12, 2015 through a preliminary sketch prepared from field notes. A survey of delineated areas is recommended prior to specific site planning.

Map Source: 2006 SC DNR Aerial Photography.
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