

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): January 26, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 1; CESAC-RD-D, Ferguson Waterworks, SAC-2016-01609

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: Charleston County City: North Charleston
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 32.87620° N, Long. -80.00546° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD83

Name of nearest waterbody: Noisette Creek

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

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Edisto-Santee - 03050201

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: December 27, 2016

Field Determination. Date(s): November 2, 2016

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

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

Explain: .

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There are "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.

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

- TNWs, including territorial seas
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- Relatively permanent waters² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
- Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: 0.335 acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

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

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

Explain: .

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

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

1. TNW

Identify TNW: .

Summarize rationale supporting determination: .

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

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

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

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

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are “relatively permanent waters” (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts a 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: Edisto-Santee (03050201) 1,923,528 acres

Drainage area: 6.328 acres

Average annual rainfall: 51 inches

Average annual snowfall: 0 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

Tributary flows directly into TNW.

Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW.

Project waters are 2-5 river miles from TNW.

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

Project waters are 1-2 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.

Project waters are 1 (or less) aerial (straight) miles from RPW.

Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A.

Identify flow route to TNW⁵: A seasonal relatively permanent water (SRPW) drains the 6.328 acre site under review (including the on-site wetlands), the SRPW flows from the site into Filbin Creek (approximately 1 river mile), and Filbin Creek flows into Cooper River a TNW (approximately 3.5 river miles).

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

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

Tributary stream order, if known: First Order Stream.

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

Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain:
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: The SRPW has been channelized along the side of the rail road tracks and passes through a culvert under the railway yard near the review site.

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

Average width: 3 feet
Average depth: 1 feet
Average side slopes: 2:1.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: The UNT immediately outside the review site was in a stable condition. However, it appeared the nearby culvert causes water to backup and pool within the stream channel.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. none Explain: .

Tributary geometry: Relatively straight.

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): .001%

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: Seasonal flow

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: 11-20

Describe flow regime: The UNT has intermittent flow.

Other information on duration and volume: The UNT was determined be intermittent based on being a first order stream and having a small drainage area.

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 the presence of litter and debris
 changes in the character of soil destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 shelving the presence of wrack line
 vegetation matted down, bent, or absent sediment sorting
 leaf litter disturbed or washed away scour
 sediment deposition multiple observed or predicted flow events
 water staining abrupt change in plant community
 other (list):
 Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ Explain: .

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

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

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

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

Explain: The water was relatively clear during the site visit. Water quality can be presumed to be hospitable to wildlife

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.

because fish were seen during the site visit. The drainage area for the UNT is highly developed. The on-site wetlands act as storm water controls for this area.

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

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

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width): The SRPW abutting the review site has an approximately 10 foot wide riparian area on the east side and the west side abuts the railroad tracks.
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: The on-site wetlands abut the SRPW.
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: Fish were seen on site during the site visit.
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: The UNT provides habitat for aquatic and terrestrial 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: 0.335 acres

Wetland type. Explain: A mix of scrub shrub and forested.

Wetland quality. Explain: Impaired. The wetlands are within a developed area, contain invasive species, and function as detention basins.

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. No Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Intermittent flow**. Explain: The on-site wetlands abut a RPW with intermittent, seasonal flow.

Surface flow is: **Discrete and confined**

Characteristics:

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

Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

Directly abutting

Not directly abutting

Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:

Ecological connection. Explain:

Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **2-5** 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 **2-year or less** floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain. The wetlands function as storm water retention basins, providing water storage for the watershed. The wetlands also function to filter sediment and other pollutants within the water.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: There are no known pollutants.

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

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): The wetlands and immediate surrounding areas are scrub shrub/forested providing a minimal riparian buffer for the wetlands.
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: The wetlands are 100% covered with vegetation. The wetlands are a mix of scrub shrub/forested.
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: The wetlands may provide habitat for both aquatic and terrestrial wildlife by providing food, water, and shelter.

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

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Wetlands A-E)

Approximately (6.328) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

(Due to the review area being surrounded by development with unknown storm water flow underground, in a relatively flat landscape the drainage area for the cumulative analysis was kept small encompassing the interior of the review area boundary to include the preserved wetlands.)

Preserved Wetlands A – C are protected under Corps Permit No. SAC-26-98-0064(A) and are not included in this review area, nor this Jurisdictional Determination. However, since the wetlands are known they are being considered in this cumulative analysis.

	<u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u>	<u>Size (in acres)</u>
Preserved Wetland A	Y	0.111
Preserved Wetland B	Y	0.337
Preserved Wetland C	Y	0.098
Jurisdictional Wetland D	Y	0.091
Jurisdictional Wetland E	Y	0.244

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The 5.782 acre review area contains 0.335 acres of jurisdictional wetlands. The 6.328 acre drainage area for the cumulative analysis contains an additional 0.546 acres of preserved wetlands for a total of 0.881 acres of wetlands. The 0.881 acres of wetlands within the drainage area provide a variety of functions that are important for the downstream waters and the watershed as a whole. The wetlands not only provide habitat for various aquatic and terrestrial organisms, including a variety of insects, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and birds, but are also a source of food, nutrients, and carbon for organisms located downstream. The wetlands are especially important for the water quality of a watershed. Water runoff from surrounding uplands that may contain pollutants, sediments, excess nutrients, etc., that flow through the wetlands before entering the tributary system has the opportunity to be filtered out prior to flowing to downstream TNWs. In addition, excess water can temporarily be stored thereby minimizing potential flooding of downstream areas and can also slowly release water downstream to maintain seasonal flow volumes. Runoff water may also transport organisms, nutrients, and carbon from the wetlands into the tributaries, which continue to flow to downstream TNWs.

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW. Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the *Rapanos* Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below:

1. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D:
2. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:
3. **Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:

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

The 5.782 acre review area contains 0.335 acres of jurisdictional wetlands. The 6.328 acre drainage area for the cumulative analysis contains an additional 0.546 acres of preserved wetlands for a total of 0.881 acres of wetlands. Note: due to the review area being surrounded by development with unknown storm water flow underground, in a relatively flat landscape the drainage area for the cumulative analysis was kept small encompassing the interior of the review area boundary to include the preserved wetlands. The 0.881 acres of wetlands (wetlands A-E) within the drainage area directly abut the SRPW and hydrologic flow continues into Flubin Creek and then into the Copper River a TNW.

The 0.881 acres of wetlands within the drainage area provide a variety of functions that are important for the downstream waters and the watershed as a whole. The wetlands not only provide habitat for various aquatic and terrestrial organisms, including a variety of insects, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and birds, but are also a source of food, nutrients, and carbon for organisms located downstream. The wetlands are especially important for the water quality of a watershed. Water runoff from surrounding uplands that may contain pollutants, sediments, excess nutrients, etc., that flow through the wetlands before entering the tributary system has the opportunity to be filtered out prior to flowing to downstream TNWs. In addition, excess water can temporarily be stored thereby minimizing potential flooding of downstream areas and can also slowly release water downstream to maintain seasonal flow volumes. Runoff water may also transport organisms, nutrients, and carbon from the wetlands into the tributaries, which continue to flow to downstream TNWs. Therefore, the wetlands within the review area have a significant nexus to downstream TNWs as they provide a source of carbon and nutrients, can provide water quality functions, can store excess water minimizing flooding impacts downstream, can maintain seasonal flow volumes, and can transport organisms, carbon, and nutrients.

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: **As discussed in Section III.B the UNT has flow more than three months out of the year.**

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply): The UNT is not within the review area.

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.

Identify type(s) of waters: .

3. Non-RPWs⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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

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

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.

Identify type(s) of waters: .

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

Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.

Wetlands directly abutting a 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 wetlands directly flow into the UNT a RPW discussed in Section III.D.2**

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: **0.335**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.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

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

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

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

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

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

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

Explain:

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

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

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

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

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

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

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.

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.

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: **Jurisdictional Determination Request package received October 18, 2016 submitted on behalf of Ferguson Enterprises Inc. by Sabine & Waters, 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:
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: 1:24 Quad Ladson, SC .
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):
or Other (Name & Date):
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: **SAC-26-98-0064(A), June 18, 1998.**
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The 5.782 acre review area contains 0.335 acres of waters of the U.S. subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. These waters include Jurisdictional Wetland D (0.091 acres) and Jurisdictional Wetland E (0.244 acres). Refer to the survey prepared for Ferguson Enterprises Inc. titled Wetland Delineation Survey of 4711 Rivers Avenue, TMS No. 470-01-00-018, signed by Joshua W. Nance November 17, 2016.

The 0.546 acres of Preserved Wetlands A-C are not included in this review because they are protected wetland areas under DA permit No. SAC-26-98-0064(A). Under DA permit No. SAC-26-98-0064(A) these protected wetland areas were constructed to serve as compensatory wetland mitigation and serve as storm water retention basins.