Approved Jurisdictional Determination Form
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): August 12, 2015

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 1; CESAC -RD-NE; SAC 2015-00470-4S Southeastern Freightline Expansion

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State: South Carolina
County/parish/borough: Florence
City: Florence
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.201011° N, Long. -79.792546° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD83
Name of nearest waterbody: Beaverdam Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: The Aquatic Resource (Isolated Wetland) documented on this basis form does not flow directly or indirectly into a TNW.
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Middle Pee Dee HUC:03040201_09

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
- Office (Desk) Determination. Date:
- Field Determination. Date(s): May 06, 2015 and June 30, 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 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 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: acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List, Pick List, Pick List
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): N/A.

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): 3
   - Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
   Explain: A potentially jurisdictional wetland, totaling 0.608 acres, located within the project area was determined to be

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.
non-jurisdictional due to the lack of discernible or traceable outfall connections to other Waters of the US. Based on a site visit conducted on May 06, 2015, the wetland in itself meets the criteria set forth in the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual and the 2010 Coastal Plain Supplement; however no traceable outfalls to other waters of the U.S. were observed. The wetland is bisected by a non-jurisdictional ditch (non-jurisdictional ditch #1) that flows north into a large drainage ditch located along the northern property boundary (non-jurisdictional ditch #2). Based on a site visit conducted on May 06, 2015 non-jurisdictional ditch #2 had an OHWM and showed evidence of flow in the form of drift deposits, into a culvert that continued off-site under an adjacent industrial park. Florence County LiDAR depicts non-jurisdictional ditch #2 as terminating at the western property line with the only possible outfall for this culvert being a storm water retention pond located to the north of the adjacent industrial park, along W. Sumter Street. This storm water retention pond has overflow drainage into a road side ditch that runs from W. Sumter Street north along Flynn Street and is depicted on Florence County LiDAR maps as terminating in uplands. During a site visit conducted on June 30, 2015 this ditch was observed to be filled with leaf litter and overgrown with vegetation. There was no evidence of flow within the ditch. The ditch was observed from its origin on Sumter Street to the end of Flynn Street where it continued onto private property and could no longer be followed. In addition, during the site visit on June 30, 2015 an investigation was conducted along N. Schofield Street, W. Sumter Street, N. Cashua Ferry Road and W. Darlington Street for the purpose of indentifying any additional possibilities for a downstream connection. No other possible outfalls or connections were observed. Based on the best available resources to this office, to include: aerial photographs, NWIs, LiDAR, and soil survey information, the wetland on site was determined to have no discernible or traceable outfall connections to other Waters of the US.

Two non-jurisdictional ditches are located within the project area. Non-jurisdictional Ditch #1 originates in uplands at the northern most limit of development on-site where it drains stormwater run-off, through the onsite wetland, north to a large drainage ditch located along the northern property boundary (non-jurisdictional ditch #2). During a site visit conducted on May 06, 2015 this ditch was observed to be filled with leaf litter and debris and overgrown with woody vegetation at its southern end, as the ditch moved further north it deepened and developed a notable bed and bank. This ditch bisects the eastern wetland boundary and terminates in the ditch located along the northern property boundary (non-jurisdictional ditch #2) which is determined to have no traceable outfall to a water of the US and therefore this ditch is determined to be non-jurisdictional.

Non-Jurisdictional Ditch #2 originates off-site and runs east to west, entirely through uplands, along the northern property boundary. Based on a site visit conducted on May 06, 2015 this ditch had an OHWM and showed evidence of flow (i.e. drift deposits) into a culvert that continues off-site under an adjacent industrial park. Florence County LiDAR depicts this ditch as terminating at the western property boundary with the only possible outfall for this culvert being a stormwater detention pond located to the north of the adjacent industrial park along W. Sumter Street. This stormwater detention pond has overflow drainage into a road side ditch that runs from W. Sumter Street along Flynn Street where it is depicted as terminating in uplands. During a site visit conducted on June 30, 2015 the road side ditch was observed to be filled with leaf litter and overgrown with vegetation. There was no evidence of flow within the ditch. The ditch was observed from its origin on Sumter Street to the end of Flynn Street where it continued out of site onto private property and could no longer be followed. Based on the best available resources to this office this ditch was excavated out of uplands and has no traceable connection to a water of the US and therefore is determined to be non-jurisdictional.
SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW
   Identify TNW: .

   Summarize rationale supporting determination: .

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW
   Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”: .

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

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

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

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

If the waterbody4 is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

   (i) General Area Conditions:
      Watershed size: Pick List ;
      Drainage area: Pick List
      Average annual rainfall: inches
      Average annual snowfall: inches

   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
      (a) Relationship with TNW:
         ☐ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
         ☐ Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.

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

         Identify flow route to TNW5: .
         Tributary stream order, if known: .

---

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

5 Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.
(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):

**Tributary** is:
- [ ] Natural

**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/\% 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:

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

Explain: .

Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

---

\(^6\)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.
(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>
</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:  
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Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:

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

3. Non-RPWs8 that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
- Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

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

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.
- 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 man-made ditches are located within the project area and are determined to be non-jurisdictional features.

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: 0.608 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: The project area is on a plat prepared by Hoyt + Bernyi, titled "WETLAND DELINEATION SURVEY / SHOWING TMS #90045-01-001, / CONTAINING 0.608 AC. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WETLAND, / 7.969 AC. HIGHLAND, TOTALING 8.577 AC., / PROPERTY OF SOUTHEASTERN FREIGHT LINES, / LOCATED AT 1421 W. DARLINGTON STREET / FLORENCE COUNTY, SC," and dated July 15, 2015.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Florence West Quad: The USGS topographic survey information within Florence West Quad depicts the project area as being located within a developed urban area. The project area is depicted as consisting of cleared developed uplands adjacent to an undeveloped forested area to the north. There are no blue line features and/or other symbols that would typically represent a water of the US located within the project area.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Florence County Soil Survey Sheet 10 depicts the project area as being comprised of the following soil types: Lynchburg and Rains. Lynchburg is a somewhat poorly drained partially hydric sandy loam. Rains is a poorly drained all hydric sandy loam.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: U13 and U42P; The NWI map depicts the project area as consisting of a combination of industrial uplands and irregularly flooded upland evergreen forest.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Florence County Aerial Index 99:11227:48 and SCDNR 2006. or Other (Name & Date): Photographs submitted by ECS dated 03/26/15 and site photos taken by the Corps dated 5/6/2011 and 6/30/2015.
B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: This Form addresses a 0.608 acre isolated wetland. The site visit was conducted during a period of normal climatic conditions as determined by NRCS WETS data. A potentially jurisdictional wetland, totaling 0.608 acres, located within the project area was determined to be non-jurisdictional due to the lack of discernible or traceable outfall connections to other Waters of the US based on a site visit conducted on May 06, 2015 and June 30, 2015 and a review of USGS topographic maps, NWIs, aerial photographs and Florence County LiDAR. The wetland in itself meets the criteria set forth in the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual and the 2010 Coastal Plain Supplement; however no traceable outfalls to other waters of the US were observed on-site, in aerial photographs, or on Florence County LiDAR. The isolated wetland is bisected by a non-jurisdictional ditch (non-jurisdictional ditch #1) that flows north into a large drainage ditch located along the northern property boundary (non-jurisdictional ditch #2). Based on a site visit conducted on May 06, 2015 this ditch had an OHWM and showed evidence of flow, such as wrack lines, into a culvert that continued off-site under an adjacent industrial park. Florence County LiDAR depicts the only possible outfall for this culvert as a storm water retention pond located to the north of the adjacent industrial park adjacent to Sumter Street. This storm water retention pond has overflow drainage into a road side ditch that runs from W. Sumter Street north along Flynn Street and is depicted in Florence County LiDAR as terminating in uplands. During a site visit conducted on June 30, 2015 the road side ditch was observed to be filled with leave litter and overgrown with vegetation. There was no evidence of flow within the ditch. The ditch was observed from its origin on Sumter Street to the end of Flynn Street where it continued out of site onto private property. In addition, during the site visit on June 30, 2015 an investigation was conducted along N. Schofield Street, W. Sumter Street, N. Cashua Ferry Road and W. Darlington Street for the purpose of indentifying any additional possibilities for a downstream connection. No other possible outfalls or connections were observed, therefore, based on the best available resources to this office, to include: multiple site visits, aerial photographs, NWIs, Florence County LiDAR, and soil survey information, the wetland on site was determined to have no discernible or traceable outfall connections to other Waters of the US.