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): May 30, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: CESAC-RD-NE; JD Form 1 of 2; SAC 2016-01481 Ashbrook Subdivision Phases II and III

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina   County/parish/borough: Sumter   City: Sumter
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.898131° N, Long. -80.414688° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator:
   Name of nearest waterbody: Causeway Branch
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: The aquatic resources remain confined within the project boundary and do not flow into a TNW.
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03040205-03
   Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request. [X]
   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: 
   Field Determination. Date(s): October 19, 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 no “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: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
      Wetlands: acres.

   c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List, Pick List, Pick List
      Elevation of established OHWM (if known): N/A.

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: Two isolated wetlands, totaling 11.6 acres, were assessed within the review area and determined to be non-

---

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.
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jurisdictional wetlands. The topographic map depicts both of these wetlands as bays with no outlet or blue line depicted. The aerals depict these wetlands as cleared with no potential linear features within or adjacent to the boundary of the wetlands. The NWIs depict both isolated wetlands as uplands (U21). The soil survey maps Isolated Wetland "A" as Rembert, which is a hydric soil, and Isolated Wetland "B" as McColl, a hydric soil. These freshwater wetlands were viewed during the site visit and determined to be completely surrounded by uplands. Isolated Wetland "A" is separated from the remainder of the bay by a railroad track with no culvert or other connection to the remainder of the bay. According to the topographic map, the remainder of the bay (the northern portion) has a straight linear feature exiting it that terminates within uplands. No other features are depicted on the topographic map. The Isolated Wetland "B" located near the southeastern property corner has an upland swale exiting the southern end of the wetland that terminates within uplands prior to intersecting McCrays Mill Road (SC Hwy 33). This swale was observed as having terrestrial vegetation in the bottom and no OHWM. No indicators of flowing water were observed within the swale, and the southern end of the swale terminated within uplands adjacent to McCrays Mill Road. Because these two wetlands are surrounded by uplands, no surface or shallow subsurface connections from these wetlands to any Waters of the US (WOUS) were viewed during the site visit. A review of a previous jurisdictional determination completed on this site (SAC 2004-35599, letter dated May 31, 2005; and SAC 2004-05387, letter dated April 2, 2012) determined that Isolated Wetland "A" was uplands and Isolated Wetland "B" was isolated.

These depressional wetlands exhibited hydric soils, hydrophytic vegetation, and indicators of hydrology, which satisfied the criteria set forth in the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual and the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Regional Supplement. All water located within or draining toward these two wetlands had no discernible or traceable outfall or connection to any WOUS. Additionally, these wetlands were found to be completely surrounded by forested uplands which further disrupts possible connections to any WOUS. Chemically, these wetlands do not affect any WOUS in the absorption/treatment of nutrients, runoff, or pollutants. Physically, the topographic location of these wetlands is such that water in each wetland is retained and eventually percolates through the soil to groundwater only, at an unknown depth, providing little if any stormwater attenuation. Biologically, these wetlands are not essential in providing organic carbon in the form of their collective primary productivity to downstream waters, resulting in the nourishment of the downstream food web. Because of the lack of discernible outfall, topography grades and lack of evidence of chemical, physical, or biological connection, these two wetlands were determined to be isolated, non-jurisdictional wetlands.

Additionally, two linear features were observed within the project boundary and determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches. Both of these features were man-made and flow through agricultural fields. The eastern linear feature originates within Jurisdictional Wetland A and continues north and provides a direct hydrological connection for Jurisdictional Wetland A to the downstream pRPW. The western linear feature continues south where it enters an upland excavated, non-jurisdictional pond located at the southwestern property corner. This area was previously determined to consist of uplands in JD SAC 2004-35599 (fka 81-2004-1864).

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: N/A.

   Identify flow route to TNW5:
   - Tributary stream order, if known:

   (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
   - Cobbles
   - Gravel
   - Bedrock
   - Vegetation. Type/cover%
   - Concrete
   - Muck
   - 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:

---

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.
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
  - shelving
  - 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:
  - 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:**

- Directly abutting
- Not directly abutting

\(^6\)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.
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:
Federaeled 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:
   - 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\(^8\) 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 abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
     - Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
     - Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow “seasonally.” Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
     - Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

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.

\(^8\)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:**

8. **ISOLOATED [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.

9. **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): **Two linear features were observed within the project area and determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches.**

   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: ___________.

   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: Report by GreenePond Consulting, LLC.
  ☒ 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: .
  ☐ USGS NHD data.
  ☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
  ☒ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Sumter West; The topographic map depicts these two isolated wetlands as bays.
  ☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Page 84; The soil survey maps wetland "A" as Rembert and Wetland "B" as McColl, which are both hydric soils.
  ☐ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: The NWIs map these two wetlands as uplands (U21).
  ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
  ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
  ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
  ☒ Photographs: ☒ Aerial (Name & Date): SCDNR 2006, 99:11204:117; The aerials depict the wetlands as cleared.
    or ☐ Other (Name & Date): Site photos provided by GreenePond Consulting, LLC.
  ☐ Applicable/supporting case law: .
  ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
  ☐ Other information (please specify): .

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Two isolated wetlands, totaling 11.6 acres, were assessed within the review area and determined to be non-jurisdictional wetlands. The topographic map depicts both of these wetlands as bays with no outlet or blue line depicted. The aerials depict these wetlands as cleared with no potential linear features within or adjacent to the boundary of the wetlands. The NWIs depict both isolated wetlands as uplands (U21). The soil survey maps Isolated Wetland "A" as Rembert, which is a hydric soil, and Isolated Wetland "B" as McColl, a hydric soil. These freshwater wetlands were viewed during the site visit and determined to be completely surrounded by uplands. Isolated Wetland "A" is separated from the remainder of the bay by a railroad track with no culvert or other connection to the remainder of the bay. According to the topographic map, the remainder of the bay (the northern portion) has a straight linear feature exiting it that terminates within uplands. No other features are depicted on the topographic map. The Isolated Wetland "B" located near the southeastern property corner has an upland swale exiting the southern end of the wetland that terminates within uplands prior to intersecting McCrays Mill Road (SC Hwy 33). This swale was observed as having terrestrial vegetation in the bottom and no OHWM. No indicators of flowing water were observed within the swale, and the southern end of the swale terminated within uplands adjacent to McCrays Mill Road. Because these two wetlands are surrounded by uplands, no surface or shallow subsurface connections from these wetlands to any Waters of the US (WOUS) were viewed during the site visit. A review of a previous jurisdictional determinations completed on this site (SAC 2004-35599, letter dated May 31, 2005; and SAC 2004-05387, letter dated April 2, 2012) determined that Isolated Wetland "A" was uplands and Isolated Wetland "B" was isolated.

C. D. Additionally, two linear features were observed within the project boundary and determined to be non-jurisdictional ditches. Both of these features were man-made and flow through agricultural fields. The eastern linear feature originates within Jurisdictional Wetland A and continues north and provides a direct hydrological connection for Jurisdictional Wetland A to the downstream pRPW. The western linear feature continues south where it enters an upland excavated, non-jurisdictional pond located at the southwestern property corner. This area was previously determined to consist of uplands in JD SAC 2004-35599 (fka 81-2004-1864).
SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): May 30, 2017

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: CESAC-RD-NE; JD Form 2 of 2; SAC 2016-01481 Ashbrook Subdivision Phases II and III

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina   County/parish/borough: Sumter   City: Sumter
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.898131° N, Long. -80.414688° W.
   Universal Transverse Mercator:
   Name of nearest waterbody: Causeway Branch
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Black River
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03040205-03

   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: 
   Field Determination. Date(s): October 19, 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 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: (Jurisdictional Wetland A) 3.09 acres.

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

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):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: Black River.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: According to the USACE Navigability Study Report No. 6, the Black River's recommended limit of navigability is located at River Mile (RM) 107.7, at its confluence with the Pocotaligo River. The project waters flow into Cane Savannah Creek and then into the Pocotaligo River, which enters the Black River at RM 107.7.

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 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: 88,147 acres
- Drainage area: 212 acres
- Average annual rainfall: 48.52 inches
- Average annual snowfall: 0.2 inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

- Relationship with TNW:
  - [ ] Tributary flows directly into TNW.
  - [x] Tributary flows through 4 tributaries before entering TNW.

- Project waters are 25-30 river miles from TNW.
- Project waters are 1-2 river miles from RPW.
- Project waters are 20-25 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
- Project waters are 1-2 aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
- Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A.

---

4 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
Identify flow route to TNW: The unnamed tributary of Causeway Branch flows into Causeway Branch, a pRPW. Causeway Branch flows into Green Swamp, pRPW, via Second Mill Pond. Green Swamp flows into Cane Savannah Creek and becomes the Pocotaligo River, a PRPW. The Pocotaligo River continues southeast where it enters the Black River, a TNW.

Tributary stream order, if known: The offsite tributary is a 1st order stream.

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

Tributary is: ☑ Natural

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
- Average width: 10 feet
- Average depth: 5 feet
- Average side slopes: **Vertical (1:1 or less)**

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
- ☑ Silts
- ☑ Sands
- ☑ Concrete
- ☑ Cobble
- ☑ Gravel
- ☑ Muck
- ☑ Bedrock
- ☑ Vegetation. Type/cover: 
- ☑ Other. Explain: .

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: The tributary is relatively stable with no erosion or sloughing banks observed.

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: N/A.

Tributary geometry: **Meandering.**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: **Perennial flow**

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

Describe flow regime: The off-site tributary receives discrete and confined flow from the upstream non-jurisdictional ditch.

Other information on duration and volume: The tributary also receives flow from upstream wetlands that flow directly into the non-jurisdictional ditch.

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
- ☑ OHWM:<sup>6</sup> (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:<sup>7</sup> Explain: .

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):
- ☑ High Tide Line indicated by:
  - ☑ 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.

---

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

<sup>6</sup>A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody’s flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.
(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).
Explain: The tributary is located within the Cane Savannah Creek Watershed (HUC 03040205-03). This watershed is comprised of 26.2% forested land, 24.5% agricultural land, 24.4% urban land, 22.6% forested wetland, 1.1% nonforested wetland, 0.8% water, and 0.4% barren land.
Identify specific pollutants, if known: According to the SCDHEC Watershed Assessment, a review of the downstream monitoring station located on Green Swamp (PD-039) shows that this site does not support aquatic life uses due to dissolved oxygen excursions. Recreational uses are supported; however, there is a significant increasing trend in fecal coliform bacteria concentrations. There is also a significant increasing trend in pH.

(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: This RPW provides important habitat and a corridor for wildlife, as well as a connection to the downstream TNW for aquatic species.

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: (Jurisdictional Wetland A) 3.09 acres
- Wetland type. Explain: Palustrine emergent and Palustrine forested.
- Wetland quality. Explain: Partially impaired; A portion of the wetland has been clearcut and maintained in an herbaceous state due to the presence of a utility easement.
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: N/A.

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: .
Surface flow is: Discrete and confined
Characteristics: This wetland is connected to the downstream TNW via a non-jurisdictional ditch.
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: Jurisdictional Wetland A has a direct hydrological connection to the downstream perennial RPW located off site via a non-jurisdictional ditch that exits the northern portion of the wetland and flows north.
- Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are 25-30 river miles from TNW.
Project waters are 20-25 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: Wetland to navigable waters.
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the 100 - 500-year 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: Water present on the surface of the wetlands was typical of blackwater seen in this area. These wetlands are located within the Cane Savannah Creek Watershed (HUC 03040205-03). This watershed is comprised of 26.2% forested land, 24.5% agricultural land, 24.4% urban land, 22.6% forested wetland, 1.1% nonforested wetland, 0.8% water, and 0.4% barren land.
Identify specific pollutants, if known: According to the SCDHEC Watershed Assessment, a review of the downstream monitoring station located on Green Swamp (PD-039) shows that this site does not support aquatic life uses due to dissolved oxygen excursions. Recreational uses are supported; however, there is a significant increasing trend in fecal coliform bacteria concentrations. There is also a significant increasing trend in pH.
(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: Acer rubrum (FAC), Liquidambar styraciflua (FAC).
- Habitat for:
  - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
  - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
  - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
  - Aquatic/wildlife diversity. Explain findings: This wetland provides an important aquatic habitat in a watershed predominately consisting of forested uplands and agricultural land.

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
   All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 2
   Approximately (9) 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>N</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: The 1st order perennial RPW and the approximately 9 acres of wetlands located adjacent to this RPW contribute vital biological, chemical, and physical functions to the downstream TNW. These wetlands and the pRPW make up an important ecological system with vital aquatic habitat that supports an abundance of wildlife in a watershed that consists predominately of agricultural land and forested uplands. Due to the prevalence of agriculture land use in this watershed, these wetlands and the adjacent pRPW are acting as a catch basin for the adjacent uplands by filtering sediments, herbicides, and other pollutants and by reducing the amount of flood waters reaching the downstream TNW.

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:  
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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:

   - The onsite wetland labeled Jurisdictional Wetland A on the plat is contributing vital biological, chemical, and physical functions to the downstream TNW. This wetland is providing important aquatic habitat used for feeding, nesting, and other functions that support wildlife in a watershed dominated by uplands, urban land, and agricultural fields. This wetland is also acting as a catch basin for the adjacent uplands by filtering sediments, herbicides, and other pollutants and by reducing the amount of flood waters reaching the downstream TNW. Due to the prevalence of agricultural land use and forested land use in this watershed, the off-site perennial RPW and the adjacent wetlands are a vital part of the 212 acre drainage area and were determined to have a significant nexus to the downstream TNW.

**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: The offsite tributary was determined to have perennial flow based on a review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey, and NWIs. This tributary is depicted as a solid blue line on the topo map and as a shaded linear feature on the aerials. The soil survey maps this tributary as Osier, a hydric soil. The NWIs map this tributary and the abutting wetlands as PFO1C and PFO1Ad. This tributary flows directly into Causeway Branch, a pRPW, which flows into GReen Swamp, a pRPW. Green Swamp flows into Cane Savannah Creek and becomes the Pocotaligo River, a PRPW. The Pocotaligo River continues southeast where it enters the Black River, a TNW.

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

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

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

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

---

*See Footnote # 3.*
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 estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: (Jurisdictional Wetland A) 3.09 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):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.
☐ 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.

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.
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: Report by GreenePond Consulting, LLC; plat by Black River Land Surveying, LLC.
- [ ] 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: Sumter West; The topographic map depicts Jurisdictional Wetland A as a bay with a solid blue line exiting the northern boundary of the wetland.
- [ ] USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Page 84; The soil survey maps Jurisdictional Wetland A as McColl, a hydric soil.
- [ ] National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: The NWIs map this wetland as PSS1A.
- [ ] State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- [ ] FEMA/FIRM maps:
- [ ] 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- [ ] Photographs: [ ] Aerial (Name & Date): SCDNR 2006, 99:11204:117; The aerials depict the wetland as cleared.
  - [ ] Other (Name & Date): Site photos provided by GreenePond Consulting, LLC.
- [ ] Applicable/supporting case law:
- [ ] Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- [ ] Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Jurisdictional Wetland A was determined to be jurisdictional due to a positive significant nexus as described in Section IIIC above. Jurisdictional Wetland A connects to the downstream, off-site, tributary via a non-jurisdictional ditch, which provides a direct hydrological connection. The offsite tributary was determined to have perennial flow based on a review of the aerials, topographic map, soil survey, and NWIs. This tributary is depicted as a solid blue line on the topo map and as a shaded linear feature on the aerials. The soil survey maps this tributary as Osier, a hydric soil. The NWIs map this tributary and the abutting wetlands as PFO1C and PFO1Ad. This tributary flows directly into Causeway Branch, a PRP, which flows into Green Swamp, a PRP. Green Swamp flows into Cane Savannah Creek and becomes the Pocotaligo River, a PRP. The Pocotaligo River continues southeast where it enters the Black River, a TNW.