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): 7/17/2015

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: Charleston District, Woodfield-Southpoint II, SAC-2014-01051-2JU

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

- State: South Carolina
- County/parish/borough: Charleston
- City: 
- Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 32.80203° N, Long. -80.09502° W
- Universal Transverse Mercator:

  - Name of nearest waterbody: Stono River
  - Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Stono River
  - Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03050202-02

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 9/29/14, 7/17/15
- Field Determination. Date(s): 10/28/14

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

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

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

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

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

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

      - Non-wetland waters: Jurisdictional Pond = 0.806 acres.
      - Wetlands: Jurisdictional Wetland A = 1.157 acres, Jurisdictional Wetland B = 0.065 acres, Jurisdictional Wetland D = 0.058 acres, Jurisdictional Wetland E = 0.071 acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual, Established by OHWM.

      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

---

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

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

Explain: Previous land use of the project area consisted of a nursery which appears to have been abandoned between 1989 and 1994 based on Google Earth aerial imagery. There is a remnant irrigation pond on site that appears to have been dug out of uplands. During the site visit, it was confirmed that the pond is surrounded by non-hydric soils. Evidence supporting that the pond was utilized for irrigation is present on site in the form of an abandoned pump house and irrigation lines which are documented by photographs in the administrative record. The irrigation pond is labeled as Non-Jurisdictional Pond on the survey plat associated with this jurisdictional determination. Based on the above information, it has been determined that the pond is non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

There are small portions of two other ponds located on site that are labeled as Non-Jurisdictional Ponds on the survey plat associated with this jurisdictional determination. One of the ponds appears to have been part of the nursery operation and was constructed into a stormwater pond between 2007 and 2010 based on Google Earth aerial imagery. This pond contains an overflow outlet structure and is part of a stormwater master plan for the development “Ponderosa Village Center” which appears to have been partially developed. The other pond appears to be a remnant borrow area related to the construction of the stormwater pond. It was confirmed to be surrounded by uplands during the site visit. Based on the above information, it has been determined that these ponds are non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

There are a series of ditches throughout the parcel that are remaining from the historical nursery activity. These ditches are depicted on a supplemental drawing in the administrative record. They are also visible on Charleston County LiDAR. These ditches did not display an OHW, bed and bank, or any other signs of relatively permanent flow. Based on the above information, it has been determined that the ditch network on site is non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. It should be noted that two of the ditches serve as a hydrologic connection between Jurisdictional Wetland E and other waters of the U.S. on site and one ditch serves as a hydrologic connection between Jurisdictional Wetland B and other waters of the U.S. on site during the wet season or periods of high rainfall.

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; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

1. TNW

Identify TNW: Stono River/Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW).

Summarize rationale supporting determination: The Stono River/Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW) is subject to the ebb and flood of the tides.

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”: Wetlands A, B, D, and E all flow during the wet season and periods of high precipitation to an off site roadside ditch that runs along Route 17, through a culvert under Bonanza Road continuing along Route 17 before passing through a culvert under Route 17 that discharges into the marshes of the Stono River/AIWW.

Wetland A is contiguous with the off site roadside ditch along Route 17. Wetland B flows through a Non-JD ditch into Wetland A. Wetland D is contiguous with a Jurisdictional Pond which flow into and is contiguous with Wetland A. Wetland E flows through a Non-JD ditch into the Non-JD historic irrigation pond which is connected to Wetland D by a Non-JD ditch.

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

---

3 Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.
If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is 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 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: .
   
   Identify flow route to TNW:
   
   - Tributary stream order, if known: .

   (b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):
   
   - Tributary is: [ ] Natural
   - Tributary is: [ ] Artificial (man-made). Explain: .
   - Tributary is: [ ] Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: .

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

   - 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: .

---

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.
Other information on duration and volume: .


Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings: .

Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):
- Bed and banks
- OHWM (check all indicators that apply):
  - clear, natural line impressed on the bank
  - changes in the character of soil
  - shelving
  - vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
  - leaf litter disturbed or washed away
  - sediment deposition
  - water staining
  - other (list):
- Discontinuous OHWM. 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: .

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Habitat for:
  - Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
  - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
  - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
  - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

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

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

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: Pick List. Explain: .

Surface flow is: Pick List
Characteristics: .

Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings: .

Dye (or other) test performed: .

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

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.

Ibid.
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: Jurisdictional Wetland A = 1.157 acres, Jurisdictional Wetland B = 0.065 acres, Jurisdictional Wetland D = 0.058 acres, and Jurisdictional Wetland E = 0.071 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: A pond on site is a relatively permanent water feature that is perennial in nature as it does not dry up and continuously contains water. It appears to have been dug out of wetlands. It is located in an area mapped as hydric soil according to the NRCS Soil Survey. Wetland A transitions into and is contiguous with the Jurisdictional Pond in two locations. It appears as if it was excavated out of Wetland A and the spoils placed in Wetland A creating a berm. It also extends north into the site, transitions into and is contiguous with Wetland D. Based on the above information it has been determined that the pond is a relatively permanent water that is perennial, but not a tributary and therefore jurisdictional and subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

   Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
   □ Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
   ☒ Other non-wetland waters: Jurisdictional Pond = 0.806 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.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally: .

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

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   □ Wetlands directly abutting RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
   □ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

---

8See Footnote # 3.
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 acreage 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): Previous land use of the project area consisted of a nursery which appears to have been abandoned between 1989 and 1994 based on Google Earth aerial imagery. There is a remnant irrigation pond on site that appears to have been dug out of uplands. During the site visit, it was confirmed that the pond is surrounded by non-hydrick soils. Evidence supporting that the pond was utilized for irrigation is present on site in the form of an abandoned pump house and irrigation lines which are documented by photographs in the administrative record. The irrigation pond is labeled as Non-Jurisdictional Pond on the survey plat associated with this jurisdictional determination. Based on the above information, it has been determined that the pond is non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

---
\(^9\) 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.
There are small portions of two other ponds located on site that are labeled as Non-Jurisdictional Ponds on the survey plat associated with this jurisdictional determination. One of the ponds appears to have been part of the nursery operation and was constructed into a stormwater pond between 2007 and 2010 based on Google Earth aerial imagery. This pond contains an overflow outlet structure and is part of a stormwater master plan for the development “Ponderosa Village Center” which appears to have been partially developed. The other pond appears to be a remnant borrow area related to the construction of the stormwater pond. It was confirmed to be surrounded by uplands during the site visit. Based on the above information, it has been determined that these ponds are non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

There are a series of ditches throughout the parcel that are remaining from the historical nursery activity. These ditches are depicted on a supplemental drawing in the administrative record. They are also visible on Charleston County LIDAR. These ditches did not display an OHW, bed and bank, or any other signs of relatively permanent flow. Based on the above information, it has been determined that the ditch network on site is non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. It should be noted that two of the ditches serve as a hydrologic connection between Jurisdictional Wetland E and other waters of the U.S. on site and one ditch serves as a hydrologic connection between Jurisdictional Wetland B and other waters of the U.S. on site during the wet season or periods of high rainfall.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all that apply):

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
- Wetlands: acres.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
- Wetlands: acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply) - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below):

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant:  
  Wetland Delineation Submittal, Newkirk Environmental, Inc.
- Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
- Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Office concurs with determination.
- 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:  
  Johns Island Quadangle.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:  
  NRCS Web Soil Survey.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:  
  NWI Wetlands Mapper.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):  
  FEMA/FIRM maps:  
  100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs:  
  Aerial (Name & Date):  Google Earth 1989-2015.
  or Other (Name & Date):  10/28/14 site visit photographs.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:  
  Applicable/supporting case law:  
  Applicable/supporting scientific literature:  
  Other information (please specify):  

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: It has been determined that Wetlands A, B, D, and E are adjacent to the Stono River/AIWW (TNW) and therefore jurisdictional and subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. It has also been determined that the Jurisdictional Pond is a relatively permanent water that is perennial and therefore subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.