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): June 14, 2018

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: JD Form 1 of 2; SAC-2017-01931 WSW Solar

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina   County/parish/borough: Calhoun County   City: St. Matthews
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.6670° N, Long. 80.8614° W
   Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
   Name of nearest waterbody: Crim Creek
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: North Fork Edisto River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Upper Cow Caw Swamp-North Fork Edisto River - 0305020305
   ☒ 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: June 7, 2018
   ☒ Field Determination. Date(s): February 23, 2018

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

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

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.
   a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): ¹
      ☐ TNWs, including territorial seas
      ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      ☒ Relatively permanent waters ² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☐ Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☐ Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☐ Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☐ Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
      ☐ Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
      ☒ Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands
   b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area: 
      Non-wetland waters: 1,656 linear feet:  width (ft) and/or acres. 
      Wetlands: 6.43 acres.
   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual, Established by OHWM, Pick List
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known):  .

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): ³
   ☒ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
      Explain: Potentially jurisdictional waters that were assessed include a borrow pit area that is approximately 2,000 feet west of Wetland A (WA) in the northwest portion of the site. Looking at the oldest available aerial photographs, the

---

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.
borrow pit was present in 1994. During the site investigation, it was documented that some areas within the pit have established with wetland vegetation though soils were disturbed and composed primarily of gravel. Some small areas within the pit contained small areas of standing water. There is a distinct berm around most of the pit which has also naturalized. There is no indication of this area on USGWS topography maps. There is also nothing present on the NWI data. USDA SSURGO data shows Troup soil classification which is not listed as hydric. There is no evidence that this areas was previously wetland based on topography and the surrounding area. Based on submitted, available, and collected information during an on-site visit on February 23, 2018, this feature is non-jurisdictional and is not considered Waters of the U.S.

Another potentially jurisdictional water that was assessed includes a ditched area along the western portion of the site which runs intermittently northwest-southeast. In some areas the ditch is several feet deep while in others, it is at the same elevation as the surrounding farmed land. This is particularly true in the most northwestern end near the edge of the site. There are several sections where there is no clear ditch for long stretches in this area which appears to be filled in order to move farm equipment over the ditched areas. During the visit there was no water observed within any of the ditched area and soil samples taken throughout did not show any evidence that water sits in these areas for long periods of time. There was no evidence of an ordinary high water mark or any other indicators that support a decision to define this feature as a stream. Despite the USGS showing a blue line, and the NWI mapper showing a R4SBC in the area, the site inspection did not support this information. Much of the soil mapped along this ditch is classified as Dothan, Troup, and Rains. Rains is the only one classified as hydric soil but there was no evidence of hydric soil indicators from multiple soil cores taken in these areas. While both of the USGWS and NWI lines continues off-site, from what was examined from the road where the blue line would cross, it appears that much of the line has been filled “downstream” from where the ditch originates and there wasn’t any evidence that water currently moves in this area. It appears that any work of manipulating any potential aquatic features was completed a while ago as aerial photography dating back from 1994 does not indicate the presence of a stream. Much of the surrounding landscape has been severally impacted from agricultural practices. Based on submitted, available, and collected information during an on-site visit on February 23, 2018, this feature is non-jurisdictional and is not considered Waters of the U.S.

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 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

---

4 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
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: .
Identify flow route to TNW5: .
Tributary stream order, if known: .

(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):
- Tributary is: Natural

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
- Average width: feet
- Average depth: feet
- Average side slopes: Pick List.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
- Silts
- Sands
- Cobble
- Vegetation. Type/% cover: .
- Bedrock
- Gravel
- Concrete
- Muck
- 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: .
Subsurface flow: Pick List. 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

---

5 Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW.
6 A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody’s flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.
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.  

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):
-
High Tide Line indicated by:  
Mean High Water Mark indicated by:  
 oil or scum line along shore objects  
fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)  
physical markings/characteristics  
tidal gauges  
other (list):  

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

Identify specific pollutants, if known:  

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
-
Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):  
Wetland fringe. Characteristics:  
Habitat for:  
Federaally 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  

Surface flow is: Pick List  

Characteristics:  

Subsurface flow: Pick List  

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:  

---

7Ibid.
Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain: .
Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): .
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: .
- Habitat for:
  - Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
  - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
  - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: .
  - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: .

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
   All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List
   Approximately ( ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
   For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: .

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the Rapanos Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

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

1. Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D: .

2. Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D: .
3. Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to 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: Tributary A and B (JDA and JDB) are both un-named tributaries to Crim Creek. Both of these tributaries on-site are approximately 2-4 feet wide and 1 foot deep. Tributary A shows up on the USGS topography data as a blue line while Tributary B does not. Both tributaries are identified as linear palustrine features on the USFWS NWI Mapper. Tributary B flows off-site for a small portion, re-enters the site and flows into Tributary A on-site. Tributary A flows into another un-named perennial tributary which flows into Crim Creek which eventually flows into the North Fork Edisto River.
   - Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
     - Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
       - Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
       - Other non-wetland waters: acres.
       - Identify type(s) of waters:

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

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

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
   - Wetlands directly abutting 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: Wetland A and B (WA and WB on the map) are 4.34 and 2.09 acres respectively and are located in the northern portion of the site. Both wetlands form around the existing perennial tributaries and are both primarily forested except for a small finger of Wetland A which runs into an agricultural field and appears to have been logged which has resulted in an emergent wetland. Both wetlands are identified as forested wetland on NWI data and correlated with a section of Johnston soil on the SSURGO data. The two perennial tributaries associated with these wetlands are located right in the middle of each wetland.

     - 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:

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:

*See Footnote # 3.
6. **Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

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

   **Explain:**

   **E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):**
   - which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
   - from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
   - which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
   - Interstate isolated waters. **Explain:** __________
   - Other factors. **Explain:** __________

   **Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:**

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

8. **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): __________

   **Non-jurisdictional waters that were assessed include a borrow pit area that is approximately 2,000 feet west of Wetland A (WA) in the northwest portion of the site.**

   Another potentially jurisdictional water that was assessed includes a ditched area along the western portion of the site which runs intermittently northwest-southeast. In some areas the ditch is several feet deep while in others, it is at the same elevation as the surrounding farmed land. This is particularly true in the most northwestern end near the edge of the site. There are several sections where there is no clear ditch for long stretches in this area which appears to be filled in order to move farm equipment over the ditched areas. During the visit there was no water observed within any of the ditched area and soil samples taken throughout did not show any evidence that water sits in these areas for long periods of time. There was no evidence of an ordinary high water mark or any other indicators that support a decision to define this feature as a stream. Despite the USGS showing a blue line, and the NWI mapper showing a R4SBC in the area, the site inspection did not support this information. Much of the soil mapped along this ditch is classified as Dothan, Troup, and Rains. Rains is the only one classified as hydric soil but there was no evidence of hydric soil indicators from multiple soil cores taken in

---

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.
these areas. While both of the USGWS and NWI lines continues off-site, from what was examined from the road where the blue line would cross, it appears that much of the line has been filled “downstream” from where the ditch originates and there wasn’t any evidence that water currently moves in this area. It appears that any work of manipulating any potential aquatic features was completed a while ago as aerial photography dating back from 1994 does not indicate the presence of a stream. Much of the surrounding landscape has been severally impacted from agricultural practices. Based on submitted, available, and collected information during an on-site visit on February 23, 2018, this feature is non-jurisdictional and is not considered Waters of the U.S.

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 Map, WSW Solar – David Brame, Pilot Environmental Inc.
- ☒ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant:
- ☒ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report and findings.
- ☐ Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- ☒ Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
- ☒ Corps navigable waters’ study: 1977 Navigability Study.
- ☒ USGS NHD data.
- ☒ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☒ Upper Caw Caw Swamp-North Fork Edisto River - 030502030305
- ☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: 1:24,000 Saint Mathews.
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: SSURGO Data; Johnston, Rains, Troup, Dothan, Orangeburg, Fuquay, Ailey, Vaucluse, Water, Alpin.
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS NWI Mapper last modified October 1, 2017; PFO1C, R4SBC, RUBH, PUBLH.
- ☒ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- ☒ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- ☒ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☐ or ☒ Other (Name & Date): Consultant photos #1 - 8 of 8 dated August 16, 2017 and Corps photos #1 - 17 dated 2/23/2018.
- ☒ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- ☒ Applicable/supporting case law: .
- ☒ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- ☒ Other information (please specify): Calhoun County LiDAR, Site Visit on February 23, 2018.

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** Aquatic resources documented on this form include two perennial tributaries (JDA and JDB) and two wetlands (WA and WB) abutting these perennial tributaries. Also documented on this form include a non-jurisdictional borrow pit and a non-jurisdictional ditch. Pursuant to 33CFR 328.3 (b)(4)(v), the borrow pit is not considered waters of the U.S. Pursuant to Rapanos Guidance the ditch did not exhibit any evidence which would support a decision to classify it as a relatively permanent water. These two waterbodies are not subject to the Corps’ authorizes pursuant of the Clean Water Act or Rivers and Harbors Act. Pursuant to 33CFR 328.3 and Rapanos Guidance the two perennial tributaries and two abutting wetlands are considered waters of the U.S. These waters are subject to the Corps’ authorities pursuant to Clean Water Act or Rivers and Harbors Act.
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): June 14, 2018

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: JD Form 2 of 2; SAC-2017-01931 WSW Solar

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina  County/parish/borough: Calhoun County  City: St. Matthews
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.6670° N. Long. 80.8614° W. Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83

Name of nearest waterbody: Burke Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: North Fork Edisto River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Upper Caw Caw Swamp-North Fork Edisto River - 030502030305

☐ 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: June 7, 2018
☐ Field Determination. Date(s): February 23, 2018

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

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

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

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

1. Waters of the U.S.
   a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):  
      ☐ TNWs, including territorial seas
      ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      ☐ Relatively permanent 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: 515 linear feet:  width (ft) and/or acres.
      Wetlands: 4.92 acres.
      Impoundments: 6.25 acres

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

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): 3
   ☐ 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 an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

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

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

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

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

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

         Project waters are Pick List river miles from TNW.
         Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.
         Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
         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: .

---

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
- Artificial (man-made). Explain: 
- 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
- Curb
- Gravel
- Bedrock
- Vegetation. Type/% cover: 
- Other. Explain: 

**Tributary condition/stability** [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: 
**Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes.** 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
  - vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
  - leaf litter disturbed or washed away
  - sediment deposition
  - water staining
  - other (list):
- Discontinuous OHWM.\(^7\) Explain: 

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):
- High Tide Line indicated by: 
- Mean High Water Mark indicated by: 
- oil or scum line along shore objects
- fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
- physical markings/characteristics
- 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: 
- Identify specific pollutants, if known: 

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics: 
- Habitat for:

---
\(^6\)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.
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: **Tributary C (JDC) is an un-named tributary to Burke Creek. The 515 linear foot tributary is entirely on-site is approximately 2-4 feet wide and 1 foot deep. Tributary C is within a draw area on the USGS topography data, but is not shown as a feature. The tributary is not present on the NWI data but does flow directly into a freshwater pond that is identified at the base of the tributary. Tributary C flows into an open water impoundment which flows into another pond surrounded by a wetland on-site which then connects to an un-named perennial tributary which flows into Burke Creek which eventually flows into the North Fork Edisto River.**
   - Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow “seasonally” (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
   - Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
   - Other non-wetland waters: acres.
   - Identify type(s) of waters: .
3. Non-RPWs\textsuperscript{8} that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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

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

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

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

☒ Wetlands directly 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: Wetland D and E (WD and WE on the map) are 2.39 and 2.53 acres respectively and are located in the south-eastern portion of the site. Both wetlands form around two ponds (PA and PB) along with the perennial tributary (JDC) and are both entirely forested. Part of Wetland E is identified on the NWI data on the most eastern portion of the wetland. The ponds within the wetlands are however identified on the NWI data. SSURGO soil data identifies water for the pond surrounded by Vaucule soils. Tributary C, a perennial tributary, is located entirely within Wetland D which both flow into Pond A and then into Wetland E and Pond B. From here they flow off-site into an un-named perennial tributary which shows up as a solid blue line which flows into Burke Creek.

☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow “seasonally.” Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

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

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

☐ Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

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

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

☐ Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and 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.\textsuperscript{9}

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

☒ Demonstrate that impoundment was created from “waters of the U.S.,” or

☒ Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or

☒ Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

Explain: The two impoundments (PA and PB) are surrounded by Wetland D and E respectively and have a perennial tributary flowing into the first impoundment (PA). From the bottom impoundment (PB) water flows off-site through an unnamed perennial tributary identified on the USGWS topography data as a solid blue line which then flows into Burke Creek.

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):\textsuperscript{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: .

\textsuperscript{8}See Footnote # 3.

\textsuperscript{9} To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

\textsuperscript{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.
- 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 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.

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 Map, WSW Solar – David Brame, Pilot Environmental Inc.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
  - Office concur with data sheets/delineation report and findings.
- USGS NHD data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. Upper Caw Caw Swamp-North Fork Edisto River - 030502030305
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: 1:24,000 Saint Mathews.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: USFWS NWI Mapper last modified October 1, 2017; PFO1C, R4SBC, RSUBH, PUBH.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- Applicable/supporting case law:
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify): Calhoun County LiDAR, Site Visit on February 23, 2018.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Aquatic resources documented on this form include one perennial tributary (JBC), two wetlands (WC and WD), and two impoundments (PA and PB). Pursuant to 33CFR 328.3 and Rapanos Guidance the perennial tributary, two abutting wetlands, and two impoundments are considered waters of the U.S. These waters are subject to the Corps’ authorities pursuant to Clean Water Act or Rivers and Harbors Act.