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): November 20, 2018

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 2; SAC # 1998-37806-MEPJ Tract

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: South Carolina
County/parish/borough: Horry
City: Myrtle Beach

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.65874° N, Long. -78.98629° W.

Universal Transverse Mercator:
Name of nearest waterbody: Un-named seasonal tributary of Raccoon Run
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Wetland “A - C & E” documented on this basis form were determined to be isolated and do not flow directly or indirectly into any TNW. Jurisdictional aquatic resources (Wetlands "D" & "F") identified within the project area are documented on basis form 2 of 2.
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Waccamaw, HUC03040206-09

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: October 29, 2018
☐ Field Determination. Date(s): previous site visits November 8, 2013, and May 28, 2008

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

   b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:
      Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.
      Wetlands: acres.

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

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): ³

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.
Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: Four (4) separate freshwater wetlands (Wetlands A-C & E) were determined to be isolated, non-jurisdictional. These wetlands were determined to be surrounded by upland soils with no hydrologic connection of any kind to any OHWM of any waters of the U.S. The isolated, non-jurisdictional wetlands located within the project area meet the parameters that define a wetland outlined in the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual and Regional Supplement; however, these wetlands were determined not to be adjacent to any waters of the United States. In addition, the project area contains numerous upland excavated non-jurisdictional ditches that were determined to drain only uplands. None of these non-jurisdictional ditches are in close proximity to wetlands identified as "A-C, & E". In addition, the site contains one upland excavated storm water pond.

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.

   4 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

Identify flow route to TNW: .
Tributary stream order, if known: .

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

Tributary is:  
- [ ] Natural

Tributary 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
- [ ] Concrete
- [ ] Cobbles
- [ ] Gravel
- [ ] Muck
- [ ] Bedrock
- [ ] Vegetation. Type/% cover:
- [ ] Other. Explain: .

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: .
Tributary geometry: Pick List. Explain: .
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
- [ ] OHWM 6 (check all indicators that apply):
  - [ ] the presence of litter and debris
  - [ ] destruction of terrestrial vegetation
  - [ ] the presence of wrack line
  - [ ] sediment sorting
  - [ ] multiple observed or predicted flow events
  - [ ] abrupt change in plant community
  - [ ] other (list):
- [ ] Discontinuous OHWM. 7 Explain: .

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

---

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.
7 Ibid.
(iii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.). Explain: .
Identify specific pollutants, if known: .

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

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

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

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
Flow is: Pick List Explain: .
Surface flow is: Pick List Characteristics: .
Subsurface flow: Pick List Explain findings: .
- Dye (or other) test performed: .

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
- Directly abutting
- Not directly abutting
  - Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: .
  - Separated by 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>
<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:  
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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:

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

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

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

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

Provide 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: .

---

8 See Footnote # 3.
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.
Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: 

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

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):
- If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements.
- Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.
- Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR).
- Waters do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: Numerous upland excavated ditches determined to drain only uplands. Several of these linear features did not display an OHWM and one upland excavated stormwater pond.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
- Wetlands: acres.
- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: 

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 & maps provided by S&ME/Plat by DDC Engineers dated 1/18/08, revised 2/19/08, 8/26/08, 8/1/13, 11/21/13, & 10/16/18entitled "Map of 520.12 Acres of Land/ Socastee Township, Horry County, South Carolina.
- 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 NHDA data.
- USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Myrtle Beach Quad: Quad depict the project area as both forested uplands and wetlands. Quad depicts the offsite tributary as a solid blue line feature. The Delineated areas of Wetlands "A-C & E" are depicted on the quad as forested uplands.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Horry County Soil Survey sheet 87 depicts the soil types of Yemassee, Ogeechee, Bladen, Meggett & Yauhannah.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: HorryNWI: NWI depicts the project area as Upland planted pines (U42P), Forested Wetlands (PFO1/4B & PFO4B) and partially drained/ditch forested wetlands (PFO4Bd).
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- or Other (Name & Date): Site photos provided by S&ME dated 10/5/18.
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: SAC 1998-37806-3H Letter dated 9/18/2008 & December 5, 2013, previous non-jurisdictional isolated determinations were coordinated with EPA & USACE Headquaters on August 26, 2008, & November 2013.
- Applicable/supportingcase law: .
B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: The project area is comprised of 520.12 acres of which 94.96 acres have been identified as freshwater wetlands. Of the 94.96 acres of wetlands, 12.22 acres (Wetland “A-C & E”) have been determined to be isolated, non-jurisdictional. The remaining 82.74 acres (Wetlands “D&F”) are jurisdictional and documented as such on basis form 2 of 2 of this determination. Forested freshwater wetlands “A-c, &E” located within the project area have been determined to be completely surrounded by non-hydric soils and no surface or shallow subsurface connection to any waters of the U.S. (WOUS) was evident during the site visit or could be found after review of aerial photography, soil survey information, NWI maps, and topographic maps. These wetlands exhibited hydric soils, hydrophitic vegetation, and sufficient indicators of hydrology to satisfy the criteria set forth in the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual. However, all water located within or draining toward these wetlands have no discernible or traceable outfall or connection to any WOUS. Chemically, the wetlands do not affect any WOUS in the absorption/treatment of nutrients, runoff, and pollutants. Physically, the topographic location of the wetland and its relation to other WOUS is such that water in these wetlands are retained and eventually percolates through the soil to groundwater only, to an unknown depth, providing little if any stormwater attenuation. Biologically, these wetlands are 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 discernable outfall, topography grades, and lack of evidence of chemical, physical or biological connection, these wetland systems have been determined to be isolated, non-jurisdictional.

Previous jurisdictional determinations were made for the project area which is documented in SAC 1998-37806-3JH, letter dated 9/18/2008, and December 5, 2013. In those determinations, Wetlands “A-C, &E” were documented as isolated, non-jurisdictional. The previous determinations were coordinated with EPA & USACE Headquarters on August 26, 2008 and November 2013.

In addition, the project area contains numerous non-jurisdictional upland excavated ditches determined to drain only uplands and one upland excavated stormwater pond.
SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 20, 2018

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 2 of 2; SAC # 1998-37806 MEPNJ Tract

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina  
   County/parish/borough: Horry  
   City: 
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 33.65874° N, Long. -78.98629° W.  
   Universal Transverse Mercator: 
   Name of nearest waterbody: Un-named seasonal RPW of Raccoon Run  
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: AIWW/Waccamaw River  
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Waccamaw, HUC 03040206-09  
   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: October 29, 2018  
   Field Determination. Date(s): Previous site visits November 8, 2013 & May 28, 2008

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.

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 (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 within 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: Wetland “F” 81.04 acres & Wetland “D” 1.70 for a total of 82.74 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):  
   - Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.
     Explain: Documented on basis form 1 of 2.

---

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: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW).
   Summarize rationale supporting determination: Subject to ebb and flood of tide.

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: 136,317 acres;
      Drainage area: 1,100 acres
      Average annual rainfall: 50 inches
      Average annual snowfall: 0 inches

   (ii) Physical Characteristics:
      (a) Relationship with TNW:
         ☑ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
         ☒ Tributary flows through 2 tributaries before entering TNW.

         Project waters are 2-5 river miles from TNW.
         Project waters are 1 (or less) river miles from RPW.
         Project waters are 1-2 aeros (straight) miles from TNW.
         Project waters are 1 (or less) aeros (straight) miles from RPW.
         Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

         Identify flow route to TNW:\: SRPW flows through a named RPW, Raccoon Run, before discharging into the AIWW, TNW.
         Tributary stream order, if known: Stream order 1.

---

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
- Manipulated (man-altered). Explain: Slope of tributary is 2:1 with a spoil berm adjacent to the north side.

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):
- Average width: 6 feet
- Average depth: 4 feet
- Average side slopes: 2:1.

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: stabilized by vegetation and debris.


Tributary geometry: Relatively straight 

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): <1 %

(c) Flow:

Tributary provides for: Seasonal flow

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

Describe flow regime: Flow is during wetter months Late fall to early spring. Stream is recharged by natural storage (ground water). Evidence that tributary was being recharged by groundwater was observed on site visit by Iron-oxidizing bacteria seeping into the channel at a specific location within tributary where the upper limits of jurisdiction was determined.

Other information on duration and volume: Hydrologic indicators observed: Channel has an even distribution of silt substrate, leaves in bottom of channel disturbed and pushed downstream, litter and debris observed on banks of channel.

Surface flow is: Confined Characteristics: Channel confined within bed and banks of tributary.

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

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

---

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

Explain: At the time of the site visit, water was not present within tributary, however litter and debris was observed within stream. Surrounding land uses consist of forestry and urban development.

Identify specific pollutants, if known: sediments, stormwater runoff.

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

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: 81.62 acres
   - Wetland type. Explain: Palustrine.
   Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:
   Flow is: Intermittent flow. Explain: during wetter months and after rainfall.
   Surface flow is: Discrete and confined
   Characteristics: Flow is through a upland excavated ditch that discharges into a RPW.
   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: Flow is through a upland excavated ditch that discharges into an RPW.
   - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
   Project wetlands are 2-5 river miles from TNW.
   Project waters are 1-2 aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
   Flow is from: Wetland to navigable waters.
   Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the 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 was not observed above the surface at time of site visit, soils were saturated to the surface. General watershed is undeveloped areas and downstream developed areas, Timber management lands.
   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: Hardwood and pines.
- 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 system enhances a variety of wildlife species by providing diversity through timber type changes and where an aquatic system adjoins an upland system.

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)
   All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: 4
   Approximately (157) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland</th>
<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>“F”</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>Offsite Wetland 1</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“H”</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>Offsite Wetland 2</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed: This wetland system enhances a variety of wildlife species by providing diversity through timber type changes and where an aquatic system adjoins an upland. Due to surrounding land uses of development and silvicultural practices, these wetlands act as a catch basin for adjacent uplands filtering sediment and other pollutants and/or reducing the amount of flood waters reaching the 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:

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 wetlands adjacent to the RPW include mixed hardwood/pine palustrine forested depressional wetlands. The wetlands which are similarly situated and adjacent to the RPW are collectively performing functions consistent with the following: Biological- A variety of biological functions are being performed which include providing breeding grounds, shelter, foraging, nesting and travel corridors for aquatic and wetland-dependent species. They enhance wildlife diversity through timber type changes and the transition between upland and aquatic systems. The wetlands are essential in providing collective primary productivity to downstream waters by supplying organic carbon, resulting in the nourishment of the downstream food web. Chemical- The wetlands and tributary within the review area are providing the important collective functions of removal of excess nutrients which are contributed by runoff from surrounding urban and silvicultural areas, reducing nitrogen and phosphorus loading downstream, and effectively preventing oxygen depletion that can result from eutrophication. Physical- The wetlands and tributary in the review area are collectively filtering sediments and pollutants carried by stormwater runoff from roads, urban development and silviculture areas. They are providing flood attenuation and flow maintenance functions by retaining runoff and releasing it slowly, which results in the
reduction of downstream peak flows (discharge and volumes) and lower continuous flow volumes. Wetlands such as the ones identified in this reach are actively storing stormwater runoff from adjacent development and silvicultural areas. Based on the collective functions described above and their importance to the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the traditional navigable waters of the AIWW, it has been determined that there is a significant nexus between the relevant reach of the tributary and adjacent wetlands to the downstream TNW. In addition, SCDHEC downstream monitoring station MD127 (approx 2 miles away just south of the TNW located on Raccoon Run) reports that aquatic life uses are fully supported; however, there is a significant increasing trend in turbidity, and pH levels. In addition, this report outlined significant decreasing trends in five-day biochemical oxygen demand and total nitrogen concentration which suggest improving conditions for these parameters.

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: Previous site visits documented the channel of the tributary has a firm sandy stream bed under a layer of silt with an even distribution of substrates. Terrestrial vegetation was absent to where the OHWM was determined. Water was not observed flowing at the time of field inspection during the wetter season but still under drought conditions. In addition, Topographic maps depict a symbol that represents a stream with perennial flow. Horry County Soil survey depict a symbol which represents a stream with intermittent flow. Aerial photos depict a well-defined channel and the Horry County Study of Main Drainage canals depict a lateral drainage canal (L-5).

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:

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.

See Footnote # 3.
Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 83.32 acres.

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

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

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

   Explain:

E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE,
   DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY
   SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):10
   - which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
   - from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
   - which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
   - Interstate isolated waters. Explain: .
   - Other factors. Explain: .

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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

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

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR
factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional
judgment (check all that apply):
   - Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
   - Lakes/ponds: acres.
   - Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
   - Wetlands: acres.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the “Significant Nexus” standard, where such
a finding is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):
   - Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
   - Lakes/ponds: acres.
   - Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: .
   - Wetlands: acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

9 To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
10 Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for
   review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.
A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below):

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Report by S&ME/Plat by DDC Engineers.
- 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: Myrtle Beach Quad depicts the project area as being forested uplands with no symbols that typically represent a WOUS.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Horry County Soil Survey depicts the project area as having the following soil types on sheet 87: Bladen, Meggett, Yemassee, Ogeechee, Yonges, Yauhannah.
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: HorryNW I depicts the project as forested wetlands and forested uplands.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Other (Name & Date): Site photos provided by S&ME dated 10/5/18.
- Applicable/supporting case law: .
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- Other information (please specify): Horry County Main Drainage Canal Study of 1979.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: Offsite tributary was determined to be an RPW with seasonal flow. Site visit was performed; however a site visit was performed on a previous JD performed on 11/8/13 under normal climatic conditions. Previous site visit of 2013 documented the following: Water was not observed flowing however hydrologic indicators observed were a well-defined channel clear of terrestrial vegetation and debris, even distribution of substrates, deposition bars, and litter and debris on the banks of tributary. Limits of jurisdiction for offsite tributary was established by a well-defined OHWM. Limits of jurisdiction of wetlands were established by 1987 Delineation Manual. It was determined and documented in Section III C of this form that both the tributary and its adjacent wetlands to have a significant nexus with the downstream TNW. In addition, wetlands were adjacent non-abutting with a direct hydrologic connection to the SRPW by an upland excavated ditch. This upland drainage feature (ditch) did not have an OHWM and therefore not considered to be a tributary.

Non-jurisdictional features documented on basis form 1 of 2.