

**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): February 27, 2020**

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME:** JD Form 1 of 1; SAC-2019-00585 Kershaw County Senior Living Facility

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: Kershaw County City: **Camden**  
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.2742°, Long. -80.6138 °.  
Universal Transverse Mercator: **NAD 83**

Name of nearest waterbody: **Camp Creek**

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): **030501040304**

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: **February 26, 2020**

Field Determination. Date(s): **May 24, 2019**

**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):<sup>1</sup>**

- TNWs, including territorial seas
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- Relatively permanent waters<sup>2</sup> (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 Jurisdictional Pond=**0.12** acres.

Wetlands: **Wetland A = 3.93, Wetland B = 0.17, Wetland C = 1.01** 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):<sup>3</sup>**

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

Explain: **The site has a non-jurisdictional 0.05 acre pond located in the south central portion of the site. This pond had a small amount of standing water with no infall or outfall structures visible. The water backs up behind concrete**

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

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

structures that appears to have been in place for a long time. There were no signs of hydrology flowing downhill from the concrete structures or up to the road east of the standing water, nor of any significant biological, physical, or chemical connection to any water of the United States. Additionally, an onsite ditch was observed and found to have no ordinary high water mark or evidence of flow other than directly in response to precipitation events. The ditch itself does not contribute to the biological, physical, or chemical characteristics of any water of the US, however it does transport flow from the onsite wetlands to an offsite, unnamed tributary to Camp Creek. Neither the 0.05 acre non-jurisdictional pond nor the ditch are waters of the US.

### SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

#### A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. **TNW**

Identify TNW: \_\_\_\_\_ .

Summarize rationale supporting determination: \_\_\_\_\_ .

2. **Wetland adjacent to TNW**

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”: \_\_\_\_\_ .

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

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

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

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

If the waterbody<sup>4</sup> 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: **175,248 acres** ;

Drainage area: **81.4 acres**

Average annual rainfall: **45.45 inches**

Average annual snowfall: **0.8 inches**

(ii) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) **Relationship with TNW:**

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through **2** tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are **2-5** river miles from TNW.

Project waters are **1-2** river miles from RPW.

<sup>4</sup> 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 **1-2** aerial (straight) miles from RPW.  
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW<sup>5</sup>: **The offsite unnamed tributary of Camp Creek flows into Camp Creek and then into the Wateree River (a Traditional Navigable Water).**  
Tributary stream order, if known: **First**.

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

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

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

Average width: **3** feet  
Average depth: **1** 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: **According to the Soil Survey, tributaries is surround by Pantego Loam. The Pantego series consists of very deep, very poorly drained, moderately permeable soils that formed in thick loamy sediments on the Southern Coastal Plain and Atlantic Coast Flatwoods. The tributary was not directly observed by this office, as it is off of the reviewed property boundaries.. Therefore tributary characteristics listed are those of similar tributaries in the area.**

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

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **Meandering**.

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Perennial flow**

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

Describe flow regime: **Although the tributary was not directly observed by this office, available mapping indicates a perennially flowing tributary (solid blue line on the topo map).**

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**. Characteristics: **Water flows in channel during normal conditions.**

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

Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

Bed and banks  
 OHWM<sup>6</sup> (check all indicators that apply):  
 clear, natural line impressed on the bank  the presence of litter and debris  
 changes in the character of soil  destruction of terrestrial vegetation  
 shelving  the presence of wrack line  
 vegetation matted down, bent, or absent  sediment sorting  
 leaf litter disturbed or washed away  scour  
 sediment deposition  multiple observed or predicted flow events  
 water staining  abrupt change in plant community  
 other (list):  
 Discontinuous OHWM.<sup>7</sup> Explain:

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

High Tide Line indicated by:  Mean High Water Mark indicated by:  
 oil or scum line along shore objects  survey to available datum;

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings;                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics         | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges                              |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list):                             |  |

**(iii) Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: **According to the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control's (SCDHEC) Watershed Water Quality Assessment (WWQA), there is high potential for continued residential, commercial, and industrial development in this watershed, which contains portions of the City of Camden and the Towns of Lugoff, Stateburg, Wedgewood, and Rembert and is adjacent to Shaw Air Force Base. U.S. Hwy 1 and U.S.Hwy 521, together with I-20 provide the growth corridors. The interchange of I-20 and U.S. Hwy 521 has a particularly high development potential. SCDHEC Land use/land cover in the watershed includes: 38.56% forested land, 26.40% agricultural land, 23.86% forested wetland (swamp), 8.17% urban land, 1.45% non-forested wetland, 1.21% water, and 0.35% barren land.**

Identify specific pollutants, if known: **It is likely that this RPW receives nutrient runoff from the adjacent roadways and development associated with the town of Camden.**

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

Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): **Forested, >300 feet.**

Wetland fringe. Characteristics:

Habitat for:

Federally Listed species. Explain findings:

Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: **Tributaries such as this unnamed tributary provide breeding grounds for**

**aquatic species.**

Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:

Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: **Tributaries such as this unnamed tributary provide habitat for**

**wildlife.**

**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: **Wetland A = 3.93, Wetland B = 0.17, Wetland C = 1.01** acres

Wetland type. Explain: **Forested.**

Wetland quality. Explain:

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

**(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:**

Flow is: **Ephemeral flow.** Explain: **All wetlands flow into a ditch on the west side of the property after heavy rain event. The ditch runs off-site south into an un-named tributary to Camp Creek.**

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**

Characteristics: **The wetlands flow through a non-jurisdictional ditch to the tributary overland during wetter months and times of heavy rain.**

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: **The wetlands flow through a non-jurisdictional ditch and overland to the tributary.**

Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

**(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW**

Project wetlands are **2-5** 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 **500-year or greater** 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: **According to the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control's (SCDHEC) Watershed Water Quality Assessment (WWQA), there is high potential for continued residential,**

commercial, and industrial development in this watershed, which contains portions of the City of Camden and the Towns of Lugoff, Stateburg, Wedgewood, and Rembert and is adjacent to Shaw Air Force Base. U.S. Hwy 1 and U.S.Hwy 521, together with I-20 provide the growth corridors. The interchange of I-20 and U.S. Hwy 521 has a particularly high development potential. SCDHEC Land use/land cover in the watershed includes: 38.56% forested land, 26.40% agricultural land, 23.86% forested wetland (swamp), 8.17% urban land, 1.45% non-forested wetland, 1.21% water, and 0.35% barren land.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: It is likely that these wetlands receive nutrient runoff from the adjacent roadways and development associated with the town of Camden.

(iii) **Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): **Forested, >300 feet.**
- 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: **These wetlands provide habitat for wildlife in the area.**

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **3**

Approximately ( **5.11** ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
<b>Wetland A (N)</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>Wetland B (N)</b>	<b>0.17</b>
<b>Wetland C (N)</b>	<b>1.01</b>		

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: **All wetlands being evaluated in this significant nexus determination which are similarly situated and adjacent (non-abutting) to the RPW are collectively performing biological, chemical, and physical functions that relate to the integrity of the TNW. These wetlands provide biodiversity support by offering habitat for various amphibian, avian, and mammal species. These wetlands also provide some level of biogeochemical soil functions valuable for maintaining water quality, such as sediment trapping and nutrient removal through processes such as denitrification. Additionally, wetlands experience slower soil organic matter decomposition rates than upland ecosystems, allowing for natural carbon storage through soil organic matter accumulation. These wetlands also collectively perform flow maintenance functions, including retaining runoff inflow and temporarily storing floodwater**

**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: **All wetlands being evaluated in this significant nexus determination are similarly situated and adjacent to the RPW are collectively performing biological, chemical, and physical functions that relate to the integrity of the TNW. The wetlands are forested and appear relatively intact. The adjacent wetlands that flow off-site through a ditch into an unnamed tributary of Camp Creek provide biodiversity support by offering habitat for various plant, amphibian, avian, and mammal species. These systems provide ecosystem functions valuable for maintaining local water quality, such as sediment trapping and nutrient removal through processes like denitrification. Additionally, these wetlands and tributaries collectively act to temporarily attenuate flood waters during large precipitation events.**

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

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

- 1. TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

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

- 2. RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

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

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

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

- 3. Non-RPW<sup>8</sup> that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

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

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

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

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

- Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.  
 Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow “seasonally.” Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:

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

<sup>8</sup>See Footnote # 3.

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: **5.11** 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.<sup>9</sup>**

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 0.12 acre impoundment on-site sits just uphill from a large wetland in the southeast corner of the site. The impoundment directly feeds water into the wetland which continue to flow off-site into a ditch which flows to an unnamed tributary of Camp Creek. The impoundment sits at the base of small rise across the site which collects water and was likely a wetland prior to a water control structure being installed.**

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):<sup>10</sup>**

- 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): **The site has a 0.05 acre non-jurisdictional pond located in the south central portion of the site. This pond had a small amount of standing water with no infall or outfall structures visible. The water backs up behind concrete structures that appears to have been in place for a long time. There were no signs of hydrology flowing downhill from the concrete structures or up to the road east of the standing water, nor of any significant biological, physical, or chemical connection to any water of the United States.**

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: \_\_\_\_\_

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

<sup>10</sup> 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.

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: **0.05** acres. List type of aquatic resource: **Pond**.
- 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: **Terracon and Lindler Surveying, Inc .**
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report. This office agrees with the conclusions of the data sheets.
  - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- Corps navigable waters' study: **1977 Navigability Study.**
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: **HA 730-G, 1990.**
  - USGS NHD data.
  - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: **1:24,000 Camden North.**
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: **NRCS Soil Survey: Rains, Pelion, Blanton, Wagram, Ailey..**
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: **USFWS: None.**
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is:            (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)  
Photographs:  Aerial (Name & Date): **1999, 2006, and 2017 Aerial.**  
or  Other (Name & Date): **Photographs 1 – 21, of 21 by Terracon and 1 – 16 of 16 by the Corps.**
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: **Preliminary JD issued on December 18, 2015**
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): **Corps site visit (May 24, 2019).**

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Aquatic resources on this form include 2 abutting wetlands, 1 adjacent wetland, 1 jurisdictional pond, and 1 non-jurisdictional pond. All jurisdictional waters on-site flow into a ditch on the east portion of the site and flows off site into an unnamed tributary to Camp Creek which eventually flows into the Wateree River. The ditch is not itself an aquatic resource, but it does provide a discrete hydrological connection from the wetlands to the unnamed tributary to Camp Creek. The non-jurisdictional pond does not have any hydrological, biological, chemical, or physical connection to any other waters on or off site.**