

DRY LAND APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM¹
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): 20MAR2020

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: SAC-2020-00159 Racepath Street Phase II

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: Horry County City: Myrtle Beach
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.6961 °, Long. -78.9051 °
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Atlantic Ocean

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Withers Swash HUC 030402080306

- ☒ Check if map/diagram of review area is 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: **March 19, 2020**
- ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

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.

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There are **no** "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area.

SECTION III: 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: Project area is depicted on a map submitted by the agent titled "Aerial Exhibit/ Racepath Road Phase II +/- 1.69 Acres/ Myrtle Beach, Horry County, South Carolina" dated January 23, 2020
- ☒ 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:
- ☐ 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: Myrtle Beach Quad; USGS topographic survey information depicts the project as a developed roadway
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Soil survey information depicts the project boundary as the mostly partially hydric (1-25%) Echaw sand, and the hydric soil Bladen find sandy loam.
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: NWIs map the project boundary as uplands.
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps:
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): SAC Regulatory Viewer, Google Earth 2019
- ☐ ☒ Other (Name & Date): Site photos submitted by the agent
- ☒ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: AJD SAC-2016-01233 letter dated September 29, 2016
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law:
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- ☐ Other information (please specify):

B. REQUIRED ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD. EXPLAIN RATIONALE FOR DETERMINATION THAT THE REVIEW AREA ONLY INCLUDES DRY LAND: This form addresses 1.69 acres of uplands in Myrtle Beach, SC. The majority of the project boundary is a paved exiting road right-of-way. A data point taken in the unpaved portion of the project boundary shows the area did not meet the

¹ This form is for use only in recording approved JDs involving dry land. It extracts the relevant elements of the longer approved JD form in use since 2007 for aquatic areas and adds no new fields.

criteria set forth in the 1987 manual. Specifically, the area did not meet the hydric soil or hydrology indicators. Based on the consistency in the depiction of uplands the project area was determined to be void of aquatic resources.