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 27, 2018
B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: JD Form 1 of 3; SAC-2017-00112 Anderson, Patricia / Melsam Solar Farm
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina   County/parish/borough: Dillon   City:
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.3425° N, Long. -79.3720° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator:
   Name of nearest waterbody: Cypress Branch
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Little Pee Dee River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): HUC 03040204-05
   ☑ 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): March 8, 2017

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There Are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
      ☐ Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
      ☐ Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.
      Explain: .
   B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There Are “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 0.55 a. (PA) acres.
         Wetlands: 0.11 a. (WA1) + 4.2 a. (WA) + 0.25 a. (WB) + 1.1 a. (WB1) + 0.50 a. (WB3) + 6.56 a. (WB4) = 12.72 acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual, Pick List, Pick List
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

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

---

1 Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.
2 For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least “seasonally” (e.g., typically 3 months).
3 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.

Explain: Several linear features were observed within the project area. These linear features are depicted as Non-jurisdictional Ditches on the sketch. Although these features are depicted on the topographic map, they are relatively straight and drain only uplands. Therefore, these features were determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches.

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: Little Pee Dee River.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: According to the USACE Navigability Study Report No. 12, the recommended limit of navigability for the Little Pee Dee River is located at River Mile (RM) 99. The project waters flow into the Little Pee Dee River at approximately RM 82.

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.

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.

---

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** aerial (straight) miles from RPW. Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

Identify flow route to TNW\(^5\): .

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. 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
- 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):
- 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
- 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
  - [ ] other (list):
- Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
  - [ ] survey to available datum;
  - [ ] physical markings;
  - [ ] vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics**: 

---

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

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

\(^7\) Ibid.
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): .  
☐ 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: .  
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries.  Explain: .  

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:  
Flow is: Pick List.  Explain: .  
Surfacer 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 a 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: The tributary located north of the project site was determined to have perennial flow based on a
review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey, and NWIs. This tributary, which is not located on site, is depicted as a named blue line on the topographic map and as a shaded linear feature on the aerials. This tributary is mapped Coxville, a hydric soil, on the soil survey, and as palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1C) on the NWIs. The perennial RPW, named Cypress Branch, flows east where it enters the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.

- 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: The wetlands labeled WA, WA1, WB, WB1, WB3, and WB4 are all portions of the same wetland system that directly abuts the off-site perennial RPW named Cypress Branch. These wetlands are depicted as forested on the aerials and topographic map. The NWIs map these wetlands as palustrine perennial RPWs (PFO1C and PFO1B). The soil survey maps these wetlands and the abutting tributary as Coxville, a hydric soil. These six wetlands continue north off site where they intersect with the boundary of Cypress Branch.

- 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: 0.11 a. (WA1) + 4.2 a. (WA) + 0.25 a. (WB) + 1.1 a. (WB1) + 0.50 a. (WB3) + 6.56 a. (WB4) = 12.72 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: The impoundment within the review area, labeled PA on the sketch, was determined to have been excavated out of jurisdictional wetland WA.

---

\(^8\)See Footnote # 3.

\(^9\) To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):\(^{10}\)

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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

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

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

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

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):

- [x] Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Report and sketch by Pilot Environmental, Inc.
- [x] Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - [x] 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: .
- [ ] USGS NHD data.
- [ ] USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- [x] U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Fork; The topographic map depicts Cypress Branch, the off-site perennial RPW, as a solid blue line. The on-site wetlands are depicted as forested uplands.
- [ ] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pg. 23; The off-site pRPW and abutting wetlands are mapped Coxville, a hydric soil.
- [x] National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: The off-site pRPW and abutting wetlands are mapped palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1C and PFO1B).
- [ ] State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .

---

\(^{10}\) 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.
FEMA/FIRM maps:  .
100-year Floodplain Elevation is:  (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
Photographs:  ☒ Aerial (Name & Date):  99:11221:10, SCDNR 2006; The aerials depict the perennial RPW as a shaded linear feature. The wetlands are depicted as forested.
   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: The wetlands labeled WA, WA1, WB, WB1, WB3, and WB4 are all portions of the same wetland system that directly abuts the off-site perennial RPW named Cypress Branch. These wetlands are depicted as forested on the aerials and topographic map. The NWIs map these wetlands as palustrine forested (PFO1C and PFO1B). The soil survey maps these wetlands and the abutting tributary as Coxville, a hydric soil. These six wetlands continue north off site where they intersect with the boundary of Cypress Branch.

The tributary located north of the project site was determined to have perennial flow based on a review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey, and NWIs. This tributary, which is not located on site, is depicted as a named blue line on the topographic map and as a shaded linear feature on the aerials. This tributary is mapped Coxville, a hydric soil, on the soil survey, and as palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1C) on the NWIs. The perennial RPW, named Cypress Branch, flows east where it enters the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.

The impoundment labeled PA on the sketch was determined to be excavated out of jurisdictional wetland WA.

Several linear features were observed within the review area and determined to be non-jurisdictional. These features are depicted as blue lines on the topographic map; however, they were determined to be excavated out of uplands and draining only uplands. Therefore, these features were determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches.
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 27, 2018

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: JD Form 2 of 3; SAC-2017-00112 Anderson, Patricia / Melsam Solar Farm

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina  County/parish/borough: Dillon
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.3425° N, Long. -79.3720° W
   Universal Transverse Mercator:
   Name of nearest waterbody: Cypress Branch
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Little Pee Dee River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): HUC 03040204-05
   ☑ 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): March 8, 2017

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
   There are “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 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: 1,725 (JDD) linear feet; width (ft) and/or 0.31 a. (PB) acres.
         Wetlands: 3.9 a. (WB2) acres.

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

   Summarize rationale supporting determination: According to the USACE Navigability Study Report No. 12, the recommended limit of navigability for the Little Pee Dee River is located at River Mile (RM) 99. The project waters flow into the Little Pee Dee River at approximately RM 82.

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**
   - **General Area Conditions:**
     - Watershed size: 121,443 acres; HUC 03040204-05
     - Drainage area: 100 acres
     - Average annual rainfall: 47.15 inches
     - Average annual snowfall: 1.5 inches
   - **Physical Characteristics:**
     - **Relationship with TNW:**
       - ☑️ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
       - ✗️ Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW.

     Project waters are 1-2 river miles from TNW.
     Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.

---

*Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.*
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: N/A.

Identify flow route to TNW: The on-site seasonal RPW flows northeast into Cypress Branch (pRPW), which flows east into the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.

Tributary stream order, if known: The tributary is a 1st order stream.

(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):
Tributary is: ☒ Natural
☒ Artificial (man-made). Explain: 
☒ Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: The middle portion of the tributary has been straightened to flow adjacent to an agricultural field.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
- Average width: 4-6 feet
- Average depth: 3-5 feet
- Average side slopes: Vertical (1:1 or less).

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

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

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: N/A.

Tributary geometry: Relatively straight. 

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

(c) Flow:
Tributary provides for: Seasonal flow

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

Describe flow regime: The tributary receives overland sheetflow from the abutting wetlands.

Other information on duration and volume: The tributary also receives flow from the upstream non-jurisdictional ditches.

Surface flow is: Discrete and confined. Characteristics: 

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: 

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
☒ 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.
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 is located within the Little Pee Dee River watershed (HUC 03040204-05). This watershed is comprised of 37.6% agricultural land, 35.6% forested wetland, 16.6% forested land, 8.2% urban land, 1.5% nonforested wetland, and 0.5% water.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: According to the SCDHEC Watershed Assessment, a review of the downstream monitoring station for the Little Pee Dee River (PD-348) shows that this site partially supports aquatic life uses due to dissolved oxygen excursions. There are also significant increasing trends in five-day biological oxygen demand and pH. Recreational uses are fully supported and a significant decreasing trend in fecal coliform bacteria suggests improving conditions for this parameter. A fish consumption advisory has been issued for the Little Pee Dee River due to the presence of mercury.

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

☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: The upstream and downstream portions of this tributary intersect wetlands.
☐ Habitat for:
  ☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
  ☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
  ☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: This seasonal RPW provides an important habitat and corridor for wildlife as well as a connection to the downstream TNW for aquatic species.

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: 3.902 a. (WB2) 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: .

Surface flow is: Overland sheetflow

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: .
☐ Ecological 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: No water was observed on the surface of the wetland. This wetland is located within the Little Pee Dee Watershed (HUC 03040204-05). This watershed is comprised of 37.6% agricultural land, 35.6% forested wetland, 16.6% forested land, 8.2% urban land, 1.5% nonforested wetland, and 0.5% water.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: According to the SCDHEC Watershed Assessment, a review of the downstream monitoring station for the Little Pee Dee River (PD-348) shows that this site partially supports aquatic life uses due to dissolved oxygen excursions. There are also significant increasing trends in five-day biological oxygen demand and pH. Recreational uses are fully supported and a significant decreasing trend in fecal coliform bacteria suggests improving conditions for this parameter. A fish consumption advisory has been issued for the Little Pee Dee River due to the presence of mercury.
(iii) **Biological Characteristics.** Wetland supports (check all that apply):

- ☒ Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): Palustrine forested; 100-250'.
- ☐ 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 wetland provides important aquatic habitat for wildlife.

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 2

Approximately (5) 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>3.9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The 1st order seasonal RPW and the approximately 5 acres of wetlands located adjacent to this seasonal RPW contribute vital biological, chemical, and physical functions to the downstream TNW. These wetlands and the sRPW make up an important ecological system with vital aquatic habitat that supports an abundance of wildlife in a watershed that consists predominately of agricultural land. Due to the prevalence of agriculture land use in this watershed, these wetlands and the adjacent sRPW are acting as a catch basin for the adjacent uplands by filtering sediments, herbicides, and other pollutants and by reducing the amount of flood waters reaching 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: .
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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 1st order seasonal RPW, which is an unnamed tributary of Cypress Branch, and the abutting wetland, contribute vital biological, chemical, and physical functions to the downstream TNW. The wetland provides important aquatic habitat used for feeding, nesting, and other functions that support wildlife within uplands. This wetland also acts as a catch basin for the adjacent uplands by filtering sediments, herbicides, and other pollutants and by reducing the amounts of flood waters that can reach the downstream TNW. Due to the prevalence of agriculture land use in this watershed, this tributary and wetland are a vital part of the 100 acre drainage area and were determined to have a significant nexus to the downstream TNW.

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

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

2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: .
   - Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally: The onsite tributary was determined to have seasonal flow based on a review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey, NWIs and site visit. The tributary is depicted as a shaded linear feature on the aerials and as a blue line on the topographic map. The soil survey maps the majority of this tributary as Coxville, a hydric soil. The NWIs map this tributary as PFO1B. During the site visit, this tributary was observed as having water-stained leaf litter and debris in the channel and a channel comprised of silts, sands and muck. Water was observed within this tributary. This seasonal RPW continues flowing northeast where it enters the perennial RPW named Cypress Branch. Cypress Branch continues east where it enters the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.
     Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
     - Tributary waters: 1,725 linear feet 4-6 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.
   - 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 labeled WB2 on the sketch was determined to directly abut the on-site seasonal RPW. This wetland is mapped Coxville, a hydric soil, on the soil survey and as a palustrine forested wetland on the NWIs. The onsite seasonal RPW intersects the boundary of this wetland.
     Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 3.90 (WB2) acres.

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

^See Footnote # 3.
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: The impoundment within the review area, labeled PB on the sketch, was determined to have been excavated out of jurisdictional wetland WB2.

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): Two linear features on site were determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches that flow into the seasonal RPW on site.

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.

---

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. 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: Report and sketch by Pilot Environmental, Inc.
☐ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
☐ 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: .
☐ USGS NHD data. ☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
☐ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Fork; The topographic map depicts the seasonal RPW as a solid blue line. The on site wetlands are depicted as forested uplands.
☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pg. 23; The sRPW and abutting wetland are mapped Coxville, a hydric soil.
☐ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: The sRPW and abutting wetland are mapped palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1B).
☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
☐ Photographs: ☑ Aerial (Name & Date): 99:11221:10, SCDNR 2006; The aerials depict the sRPW as a shaded linear feature. The wetland is depicted as forested.
☐ 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: The wetland labeled WB2 on the sketch was determined to directly abut the on-site seasonal RPW. This wetland is mapped Coxville, a hydric soil, on the soil survey and as a palustrine forested wetland on the NWIs. The onsite seasonal RPW intersects the boundary of this wetland.

The onsite tributary was determined to have seasonal flow based on a review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey, NWIs and site visit. The tributary is depicted as a shaded linear feature on the aerials and as a blue line on the topographic map. The soil survey maps the majority of this tributary as Coxville, a hydric soil. The NWIs map this tributary as PFO1B. During the site visit, this tributary was observed as having water-stained leaf litter and debris in the channel and a channel comprised of silts, sands and muck. Water was observed within this tributary. This seasonal RPW continues flowing northeast where it enters the perennial RPW named Cypress Branch. Cypress Branch continues east where it enters the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.

The impoundment labeled PB on the sketch was determined to be excavated out of jurisdictional wetland WB2.

Two linear features were observed within the review area that flow into the seasonal RPW on site named JDD on the sketch. These linear features are depicted as Non-jurisdictional Ditches on the sketch. Although these features are depicted on the topographic map, they are relatively straight and drain only uplands. Therefore, these features were determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches.
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 27, 2018

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: JD Form 3 of 3; SAC-2017-00112 Anderson, Patricia / Melsam Solar Farm

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina  
County/parish/borough: Dillon  
City:  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.3425 ° N, Long. -79.3720 ° W.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: 
Name of nearest waterbody: Unnamed tributary of Buck Swamp  
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Little Pee Dee River  
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): HUC 03040204-05  
☐ 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): March 8, 2017

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

☐ Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide. 
☐ Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. Explain: . 

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There Are “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: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres. 
      Wetlands: 4.17 a. (WC) acres. 

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual, Pick List, Pick List 
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

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

---

1 Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.
2 For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least “seasonally” (e.g., typically 3 months). 
3 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.

Explain: Two linear features were observed within the review area that flow into the off-site perennial RPW. These linear features are depicted as Non-jurisdictional Ditches on the sketch. Although these features are depicted on the topographic map, they are relatively straight and drain only uplands. Therefore, these features were determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches.

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.1 below.

1. TNW

Identify TNW: Little Pee Dee River.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: According to the USACE Navigability Study Report No. 12, the recommended limit of navigability for the Little Pee Dee River is located at River Mile (RM) 99. The project waters flow into the Little Pee Dee River at approximately RM 65.

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 waterbody1 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: 121,443 acres; HUC 03040204-05
       Drainage area: 287 acres
       Average annual rainfall: 47.15 inches
       Average annual snowfall: 1.5 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.

---

1 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
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: N/A.

Identify flow route to TNW: The off-site perennial RPW flows southeast into Buck Swamp (pRPW), which flows east into the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.

Tributary stream order, if known: The tributary is a 1st order stream.

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

- Tributary is: [ ] Natural [ ] Artificial (man-made). Explain: .

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
- Average width: 4-6 feet
- Average depth: 3-5 feet
- Average side slopes: Vertical (1:1 or less).

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
- Silts [ ] Sands [ ] Concrete
- Cobble [ ] Gravel [ ] Muck
- Bedrock [ ] Vegetation. Type/% cover:
- Other. Explain: .

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

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: N/A.

Tributary geometry: Meandering.

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 receives overland sheetflow from the abutting wetlands.

Other information on duration and volume: The tributary also receives flow from the upstream non-jurisdictional ditches.

Surface flow is: Discrete and confined. Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings: .

Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):
- Bed and banks
- OHWM6 (check all indicators that apply):
  - clear, natural line impressed on the bank
  - 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
- other (list):

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

---

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:
Charaterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Explain: The tributary is located within the Little Pee Dee River watershed (HUC 03040204-05). This watershed is comprised of 37.6% agricultural land, 35.6% forested wetland, 16.6% forested land, 8.2% urban land, 1.5% nonforested wetland, and 0.5% water..
Identify specific pollutants, if known: According to the SCDHEC Watershed Assessment, a review of the downstream monitoring station for the Little Pee Dee River (PD-348) shows that this site partially supports aquatic life uses due to dissolved oxygen excursions. There are also significant increasing trends in five-day biological oxygen demand and pH. Recreational uses are fully supported and a significant decreasing trend in fecal coliform bacteria suggests improving conditions for this parameter. A fish consumption advisory has been issued for the Little Pee Dee River due to the presence of mercury.

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
☐ Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): .
☐ Wetland fringe. Characteristics: The upstream and downstream portions of this tributary intersect wetlands.
☐ Habitat for:
☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
☐ Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
☐ Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: This perennial RPW provides an important habitat and corridor for wildlife as well as a connection to the downstream TNW for aquatic species.

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: 4.17 a. (WC) 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: .
Surface flow is: Discrete and confined
Characteristics: The wetland is connected to the downstream perennial RPW via a non-jurisdictional ditch.
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: The wetland has a direct hydrological connection to the downstream perennial RPW (located off-site) via a non-jurisdictional ditch.
☐ 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 2-5 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:
Charaterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.). Explain: No water was observed on the surface of the wetland. This wetland is located within the Little Pee Dee Watershed (HUC 03040204-05). This watershed is comprised of 37.6% agricultural land, 35.6% forested wetland, 16.6% forested land, 8.2% urban land, 1.5% nonforested wetland, and 0.5% water..
Identify specific pollutants, if known: According to the SCDHEC Watershed Assessment, a review of the downstream monitoring station for the Little Pee Dee River (PD-348) shows that this site partially supports aquatic life uses due to dissolved oxygen excursions. There are also significant increasing trends in five-day biological oxygen demand and pH. Recreational uses are fully supported and a significant decreasing trend in fecal coliform bacteria suggests improving conditions for this parameter. A fish consumption advisory has been issued for the Little Pee Dee River due to the presence of mercury.
(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 wetland provides important aquatic habitat for wildlife.

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 2
Approximately ( 5 ) 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>12</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The 1st order perennial RPW and the approximately 36 acres of wetlands located adjacent to this perennial RPW contribute vital biological, chemical, and physical functions to the downstream TNW. These wetlands and the pRPW make up an important ecological system with vital aquatic habitat that supports an abundance of wildlife in a watershed that consists predominately of agricultural land. Due to the prevalence of agriculture land use in this watershed, these wetlands and the adjacent pRPW are acting as a catch basin for the adjacent uplands by filtering sediments, herbicides, and other pollutants and by reducing the amount of flood waters reaching 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: 
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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 on-site wetland labeled WC on the sketch is contributing vital biological, chemical, and physical functions to the downstream TNW. This wetland provides important aquatic habitat used for feeding, nesting, and other functions that support wildlife in an area dominated by agricultural fields. This wetland also acts as a catch basin for the adjacent uplands by filtering sediments, herbicides, and other pollutants and by reducing the amount of flood waters that reach the downstream TNW. Due to the prevalence of agricultural land use in this watershed, this tributary and the adjacent wetlands are a vital part of the 287 acre drainage area and were determined to have a significant nexus to 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 off-site tributary was determined to have perennial flow based on a review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey and NWIs. The tributary is depicted as a shaded linear feature on the aerials and as a solid blue line on the topographic map. The soil survey maps this tributary as Coxville, a hydric soil. The NWIs map this tributary as palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1Ad & PFO1Bd). This perennial RPW was determined to flow southeast where it enters Buck Swamp, a perennial RPW. Buck Swamp continues east where it enters the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.
   - 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.
   - 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 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: 4.17 (WC) 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.**

   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):**

   - 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): **Two linear features on site were determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches that flow into the perennial RPW off site.**

   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.

---

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.
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: Report and sketch by Pilot Environmental, Inc.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant
- ☒ 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.
- ☐ USGS NHD data.
- ☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Fork; The topographic map depicts the perennial RPW as a solid blue line. The on site wetland is depicted as forested uplands.
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Pg. 23; The pRPW and adjacent wetland are mapped Coxville, a hydric soil.
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: The pRPW and adjacent wetland are mapped palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1Bd & PFO1Ad).
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s).
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps.
- ☒ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): 99:11221:10, SCDNR 2006; The aerials depict the pRPW as a shaded linear feature. The wetland is depicted as forested.
- ☐ 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: The wetland labeled WC on the sketch was determined to be adjacent, non-abutting to the off-site perennial RPW. This wetland is mapped Coxville, a hydric soil, on the soil survey and as a palustrine forested wetland on the NWIs. The wetland was determined to have a significant nexus to the downstream TNW in Section IIIC above.

The off-site tributary was determined to have perennial flow based on a review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey and NWIs. The tributary is depicted as a shaded linear feature on the aerials and as a solid blue line on the topographic map. The soil survey maps this tributary as Coxville, a hydric soil. The NWIs map this tributary as palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1Ad & PFO1Bd). This perennial RPW was determined to flow southeast where it enters Buck Swamp, a perennial RPW. Buck Swamp continues east where it enters the Little Pee Dee River, a TNW.

Two linear features were observed within the review area that flow into the off-site perennial RPW. These linear features are depicted as Non-jurisdictional Ditches on the sketch. Although these features are depicted on the topographic map, they are relatively straight and drain only uplands. Therefore, these features were determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches.