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 13, 2019
B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: JD Form 1 of 2; SAC-2019-01274; Pisgah Road;
C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
   State: South Carolina  
   County/parish/borough: Florence County  
   City: Florence  
   Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.2386 °N, Long. -79.8168 °W.  
   Universal Transverse Mercator: 17N 608963 3789060
   Name of nearest waterbody: High Hill Creek (RPW)
   Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: The aquatic resource assessed on this form is isolated and does not directly or indirectly flow into a downstream TNW.
   Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03040201-07 (Lower Black Creek)
   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): September 24, 2019

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):  
         □ TNWs, including territorial seas  
         □ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs  
         □ Relatively permanent waters  
         □ 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):  
      [Including potentially jurisdictional features that upon assessment are NOT waters or wetlands]
Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: Within the site are two non-jurisdictional features including:

1) A 0.24 acre isolated (non-jurisdictional) wetland. Indicators of the wetland feature included: a clearly defined depressional area, water marks on trees, a sparsely vegetated concave surface, hydrologic soil, broadly distributed hydrophytic broad-leaved trees, and hydrological indicators including a clay layer aquatard with iron redox masses throughout the soil sample at ~12-16 inches. 5-10 feet outside of the delineated wetland boundary all hydrologic indicators were not observed and a sandy soil with > 30% uncoated sand grains was noted. All water contained within the wetland is retained within the wetland boundary and percolates to an unknown depth. Because of the lack of discernable outfall, topography grades, and lack of evidence of chemical or biological connection, the wetland was determined to be isolated non-jurisdictional and not connected to any other waters of the U.S. The on-site isolated wetland was also determined to have NO substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.

2) A ~630 foot non-jurisdictional ditch that was excavated out of uplands for farming use at an unknown date, likely decades earlier, and is currently mostly filled in with soil, leaf litter, and debris from a former silviculture operation. The run of this feature is from the on-site RPW (see form 2 of 2) to the on-site isolated wetland; historically, this feature likely provided drainage from the isolated wetland, a concave water retaining feature, to the RPW where excess water would flow off-site.

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 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: Pick List
   Drainage area: Pick List
   Average annual rainfall: inches

---

4 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
Average annual snowfall: inches

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

Project waters are Pick List river miles from TNW.
Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

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

(b) General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):
Tributary is: ☐ Natural
☐ 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 ☐ Concrete
☐ Cobble ☐ Gravel ☐ Muck
☐ Bedrock ☐ Vegetation. Type/cover:
☐ Other. Explain:

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain:
Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:
Tributary geometry: Pick List.
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope):

(c) Flow:
Tributary provides for: Pick List
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List
Describe flow regime:
Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: Pick List, Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:
☐ Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):
☐ Bed and banks
☐ OHWM 6 (check all indicators that apply):
☐ clear, natural line impressed on the bank ☐ the presence of litter and debris
☐ changes in the character of soil ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
☐ shelving ☐ the presence of wrack line
☐ vegetation matted down, bent, or absent ☐ sediment sorting
☐ leaf litter disturbed or washed away ☐ scour
☐ sediment deposition ☐ multiple observed or predicted flow events
☐ water staining ☐ abrupt change in plant community
☐ other (list):
☐ Discontinuous OHWM. 7 Explain:

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.
6A 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.
7Ibid.
If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):
- High Tide Line indicated by:
- Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
- oil or scum line along shore objects
- fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
- physical markings/characteristics
- tidal gauges
- other (list):

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

(iv) Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):
- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics:
- Habitat for:
  - 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:
   - Wetland quality. Explain:
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

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

   Surface flow is: Pick List
   Characteristics:

   Subsurface flow: Pick List. Explain findings:
   - Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
- Directly abutting
- Not directly abutting
  - Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:
  - Ecological connection. Explain:
  - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW.
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: Pick List.
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the Pick List floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:
Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.).
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: .

- 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.**

- 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.

---

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.
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: 0.24 acres.

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

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

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

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

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: Maps, data sheets, and site information provided by the applicant’s environmental consultant, Pilot Environmental. Project map dated: "Wetland Map / Approximate 48.5-Acre Tract / Pisgah Road / Florence, Florence County, SC / Pilot Project 4959", dated August 5, 2019.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Two data sheets were submitted by the consultant, two upland and two wetland. The Corps concurs with the consultants findings.
- Corps navigable waters’ study: .
- USGS navigable waters' study: .
- USGS Hydrologic Atlas: 03040201-07 (Lower Black Creek)
- USGS USGS NHD data. USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Florence West Quadrangle USGS Topographic map depicts a forested and non-forested site with unnamed one solid blue line (aquatic) feature running along the western boundary of the site and then continuing to eastward through the southern portion of the site to Carolina Bay (labeled “Bay”); the eastward segment of this blue line feature is in the same approximate location of the on-site non-jurisdictional ditch (see section B. 2.). The blue line feature is a branch of a named tributary, High Hill Creek, an RPW, and is located approximately in the same location of the on-site delineated tributary.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: NRCS Florence County Soil Survey, sheet 4, depicts seven soil types within the project site, including: Norfolk loamy sand (0-6 percent slopes), Coxville fine sandy loam, Goldsboro loamy sand, Orangeburg loamy sand (0-2 percent slopes), Duplin fine sandy loam, Varina loamy fine sand (0-2 percent slopes) and Sunsweet loamy fine sand (6-10 percent slopes).
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: National wetland inventory (NWI) maps depict the site as almost all upland; there is one area of palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1B) on the project sites western boundary, approximately in the same location as the jurisdictional tributary and wetlands are located.
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

This 48.5 acre site can be described as previous forestry / agriculture tract bounded to the west by a tributary (RPW). The project site consists of 47.25 acres of uplands, one isolated (non-jurisdictional) 0.24 acre wetland, one 1.01 acre jurisdictional wetland, and one 2,095 linear foot tributary (an RPW). All features were spot checked for jurisdictional criteria and extent during a September 24, 2019, site visit.

Data source information: Maps, data sheets, and site information provided by the applicant’s environmental consultant, Pilot Environmental. Project map dated: "Wetland Map / Approximate 48.5-Acre Tract / Pisgah Road / Florence, Florence County, SC / Pilot Project 4959", dated August 5, 2019. Two data sheets were submitted by the consultant, two upland and two wetland. The Corps concurs with the consultants findings. 03040201-07 (Lower Black Creek). Florence West Quadrangle USGS Topographic map depicts a forested and non-forested site with unnamed one solid blue line (aquatic) feature running along the western boundary of the site and then continuing to eastward through the southern portion of the site to Carolina Bay (labeled “Bay”); the eastward segment of this blue line feature is in the same approximate location of the on-site non-jurisdictional ditch (see section B. 2.). The blue line feature is a branch of a named tributary, High Hill Creek, an RPW, and is located approximately in the same location as the on-site delineated tributary. NRCS Florence County Soil Survey, sheet 4, depicts seven soil types within the project site, including: Norfolk loamy sand (0-6 percent slopes), Coxville fine sandy loam, Goldsboro loamy sand, Orangeburg loamy sand (0-2 percent slopes), Duplin fine sandy loam, Varina loamy fine sand (0-2 percent slopes) and Sunsweet loamy fine sand (6-10 percent slopes). National wetland inventory (NWI) maps depict the site as almost all upland; there is one area of palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1B) on the project sites eastern boundary, approximately in the same location as the jurisdictional tributary and wetlands are located. LiDAR digital elevation model depicts a flat site sloping to the western boundary where an incised valley that the on-site RPW is contained within is located. Additionally, along the southeastern corner of the site the remnants of an excavated drainage ditch can be seen (see section 2. B.)

Within the site are two non-jurisdictional features including: 1) A 0.24 acre isolated (non-jurisdictional) wetland. Indicators of the wetland feature included: a clearly defined depressional area, water marks on trees, a sparsely vegetated concave surface, hydrologic soil, broadly distributed hydrophytic broad-leaved trees, and hydrological indicators including a clay layer aquatard with iron redox masses throughout the soil sample at ~12-16 inches. 5-10 feet outside of the delineated wetland boundary all hydrologic indicators were not observed and a sandy soil with > 30% uncoated sand grains was noted. All water contained within the wetland is retained within the wetland boundary and percolates to an unknown depth. Because of the lack of discernable outfall, topography grades, and lack of evidence of chemical or biological connection, the wetland was determined to be isolated non-jurisdictional and not connected to any other waters of the U.S. The on-site isolated wetland was also determined to have NO substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce. 2) A ~630 foot non-jurisdictional ditch that was excavated out of uplands for farming use at an unknown date, likely decades earlier, and is currently mostly filled in with soil, leaf litter, and debris from a former silviculture operation. The run of this feature is from the on-site RPW (see form 2 of 2) to the on-site isolated wetland; historically this feature likely provided drainage from the isolated wetland, a concave water retaining feature, to the RPW where excess water would flow off-site.

This site was assessed on a single-basis form per the provided site maps and information. Form 1 of 2 contains the non-jurisdictional waters analysis, Form 2 of 2 contains the jurisdictional waters analysis.

Isolated coordination with the EPA and USACE Isolated Waters was initiated on October 17, 2019, and considered complete on November 7, 2019, with no comments provided to SAC-RDE.
APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): November 13, 2019

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NUMBER, FILE NAME: JD Form 2 of 2; SAC-2019-01274; Pisgah Road;

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State: South Carolina
County/parish/borough: Florence County
City: Florence
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.2386 °N, Long. -79.8168 °W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: 17N 608963 3789060
Name of nearest waterbody: High Hill Creek (RPW)
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Black Creek
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03040201-07 (Lower Black Creek)
[ ] 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): September 24, 2019

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 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: 2,095 linear feet: 3 width (ft) and/or  acres.
      Wetlands: 1.01 acres.

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

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³ [Including potentially jurisdictional features that upon assessment are NOT waters or wetlands]
   [ ] Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: Within the site are two non-jurisdictional features including:

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.
1) A 0.24 acre isolated (non-jurisdictional) wetland (see Form 1 of 2).

2) A ~630 foot non-jurisdictional ditch that was excavated out of uplands for farming use at an unknown date, likely decades earlier, and is currently mostly filled in with soil, leaf litter, and debris from a former silviculture operation. The run of this feature is from the on-site RPW to the on-site isolated wetland (see Form 1 of 2); historically this feature likely provided drainage from the isolated wetland, a concave water retaining feature, to the RPW where excess water would flow off-site.

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 Creek.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: The Black Creek is considered a TNW up to the confluence of the Black Creek and Little Black Creek in Chesterfield County, well above the project sites watershed / drainage area. The Black Creek is listed as a state navigable water on both the SCDHEC Navigable Waters of SC list and the SCDNR Region 2 list of Navigable Waters. The upstream limit of this navigable water for both lists is the confluence of the Black Creek and Little Black Creek within Chesterfield County. This is located upstream of the project site. There are public boat ramps located both upstream and downstream of the project site on Black Creek. Additional indicators that the Black Creek is currently being used for commercial water-borne recreation/navigation include the presence of an RV park and several campgrounds upstream of the project site. These campgrounds also have boat ramps and public restrooms present. There is one fishing supply shop located within the City of Hartsville and several located in the surrounding area. There is also a fishing guide business that is located nearby and services this area. According to SCDNR stream gauge data, the historic average monthly flow velocity for the Black Creek in Hartsville, SC, is 223 cubic feet per second. The City of Hartsville also hosts the annual Black Creek Canoe/Kayak Festival that brings not only the public, but also vendors and businesses, to the Black Creek. These factors are all evidence that the Black Creek supports a wide variety of commercial water-borne recreation. On-site is a branch of High Hill Creek; the wetlands directly intersect the OHWM of this branch. The on-site branch flows off site, where it connects to the main tributary, and continues eastward where it directly flows into the Black Creek at ~ 34.2453, -79.7501, on the border of Florence and Darlington County.

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”: N/A

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

---

4 Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.
(i) General Area Conditions:
- Watershed size: [Pick List]
- Drainage area: [Pick List]
- Average annual rainfall: [ ] inches
- Average annual snowfall: [ ] inches

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

Project waters are [Pick List] river miles from TNW.
Project waters are [Pick List] river miles from RPW.
Project waters are [Pick List] aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Project waters are [Pick List] aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: [ ]

Identify flow route to TNW:\footnote{5}:
- [ ]

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

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: [ ]
- Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain: [ ]

Tributary geometry: [Pick List]
- Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): [ ]%

(c) Flow:
- Tributary provides for: [Pick List]
- Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: [Pick List]
- Describe flow regime: [ ]
- Other information on duration and volume: [ ]

Surface flow is: [Pick List] Characteristics:
- Subsurface flow: [Pick List] Explain findings: [ ]
- [ ] Dye (or other) test performed: [ ]

[ ] Bed and banks
- OHWM\footnote{6} (check all indicators that apply):
  - clear, natural line impressed on the bank
  - the presence of litter and debris
  - changes in the character of soil
  - destruction of terrestrial vegetation
  - shelving
  - the presence of wrack line
  - vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
  - sediment sorting
  - leaf litter disturbed or washed away
  - scour

\footnote{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.

\footnote{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.
sediment deposition  multiple observed or predicted flow events
water staining  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:
- 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:
- Wetland quality. Explain:
Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .

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

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:
- Directly abutting
- Not directly abutting
  - Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain: .
  - Ecological connection. Explain:
  - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW.
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: Pick List.
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the Pick List floodplain.

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

7Ibid.
(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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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: On-site is a branch of High Hill Creek. Jurisdictional indicators of this tributary include a sinuous (unaltered / natural) stream confined within banks featuring OHWMs, sediment sorting, and relative permanence on topographic maps which showed the RPW as an unnamed blue line feature, a branch of High Hill Creek, an RPW that directly flows into the Black Creek (TNW) at ~ 34.2453, -79.7501.
   ☐ Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):
     1. Tributary waters: 2,095 linear feet width (ft).
     2. Other non-wetland waters: acres.
     3. 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):
     1. Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
     2. Other non-wetland waters: acres.
     3. 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: On-site wetlands directly intersect the OHWM of the on-site tributary, a branch of High Hill Creek (RPW).
   ☐ Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 1.01 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 jurisidictional. 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.9
   As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.
   ☐ Demonstrate that impoundment was created from “waters of the U.S.” or

---

8 See Footnote # 3.
9 To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.
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).

**E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):**

- which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
- from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
- which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
- Interstate isolated waters. Explain: .
- Other factors. Explain: .

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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

**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: Maps, data sheets, and site information provided by the applicant’s environmental consultant, Pilot Environmental. Project map dated: "Wetland Map / Approximate 48.5-Acre Tract / Pisgah Road / Florence, Florence County, SC / Pilot Project 4959", dated August 5, 2019.
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. Two data sheets were submitted by the consultant, two upland and two wetland. The Corps concurs with the consultants findings.
- 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: 03040201-07 (Lower Black Creek)
- USGS NHD data.

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.
This 48.5 acre site can be described as previous forestry / agriculture tract bounded to the west by a tributary (RPW). The project site consists of 47.25 acres of uplands, one isolated (non-jurisdictional) 0.24 acre wetland, one 1.01 acre jurisdictional wetland, and one 2,095 linear foot tributary (an RPW). All features were spot checked for jurisdictional criteria and extent during a September 24, 2019, site visit.

Data source information: Maps, data sheets, and site information provided by the applicant’s environmental consultant, Pilot Environmental. Project map dated: "Wetland Map / Approximate 48.5-Acre Tract / Pisgah Road / Florence, Florence County, SC / Pilot Project 4959", dated August 5, 2019. Two data sheets were submitted by the consultant, two upland and two wetland. The Corps concurs with the consultants findings. 03040201-07 (Lower Black Creek). Florence West Quadrangle USGS Topographic map depicts a forested and non-forested site with unnamed one solid blue line (aquatic) feature running along the western boundary of the site and then continuing to eastward through the southern portion of the site to Carolina Bay (labeled “Bay”); the eastward segment of this blue line feature is in the same approximate location of the on-site non-jurisdictional ditch (see section B. 2.). The blue line feature is a branch of a named tributary, High Hill Creek, an RPW, and is located approximately in the same location of the on-site delineated tributary. NRCS Florence County Soil Survey, sheet 4, depicts seven soil types within the project site, including: Norfolk loamy sand (0-6 percent slopes), Coxville fine sandy loam, Goldsboro loamy sand, Orangeburg loamy sand (0-2 percent slopes), Duplin fine sandy loam, Varina loamy fine sand (0-2 percent slopes) and Sunsweet loamy fine sand (6-10 percent slopes).

National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: National wetland inventory (NWI) maps depict the site as almost all upland; there is one area of palustrine forested wetlands (PFO1B) on the project sites western boundary, approximately in the same location as the jurisdictional tributary and wetlands are located.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:

This 48.5 acre site can be described as previous forestry / agriculture tract bounded to the west by a tributary (RPW). The project site consists of 47.25 acres of uplands, one isolated (non-jurisdictional) 0.24 acre wetland, one 1.01 acre jurisdictional wetland, and one 2,095 linear foot tributary (an RPW). All features were spot checked for jurisdictional criteria and extent during a September 24, 2019, site visit.

Within the site are two non-jurisdictional features including: 1) A 0.24 acre isolated (non-jurisdictional) wetland (see Form 1 of 2). 2) A ~630 foot non-jurisdictional ditch that was excavated out of uplands for farming use at an unknown date, likely decades earlier, and is currently mostly filled in with soil, leaf litter, and debris from a former silviculture operation. The run of this feature is from the on-site RPW to the on-site isolated wetland; historically this feature likely provided drainage from the isolated wetland, a concave water retaining feature, to the RPW where excess water would flow off-site.

Wetland / RPW adjacency to TNW: The Black Creek is considered a TNW up to the confluence of the Black Creek and Little Black Creek in Chesterfield County, well above the project sites watershed / drainage area. The Black Creek is listed as a state navigable water on both the SCDHEC Navigable Waters of SC list and the SCDNR Region 2 list of Navigable Waters. The upstream limit of this navigable water for both lists is the confluence of the Black Creek and Little Black Creek within Chesterfield County. This is located upstream of the project site. There are public boat ramps located both upstream and downstream of the project site on Black Creek. Additional indicators that the Black Creek is currently being used for commercial water-borne recreation/navigation include the presence of an RV park and several campgrounds upstream of the project site. These campgrounds also have boat ramps and public restrooms present. There is one fishing supply shop located within the City of Hartsville and several located in the surrounding area. There is also a fishing guide business that is located nearby and services this area. According to SCDNR stream gauge data, the historic average monthly flow velocity for the Black Creek in Hartsville, SC, is 223 cubic feet per second. The City of Hartsville also hosts the annual Black Creek Canoe/Kayak Festival that brings not only the public, but also vendors and businesses, to the Black Creek. These factors are all evidence that the Black Creek supports a wide variety of commercial water-borne recreation. On-site is a branch of High Hill Creek; the wetlands directly intersect the OHWM of this branch. The on-site branch flows off site, where it connects to the main tributary, and continues eastward where it directly flows into the Black Creek at ~ 34.2453, -79.7501, on the border of Florence and Darlington County.
This site was assessed on a single-basis form per the provided site maps and information. Form 1 of 2 contains the non-jurisdictional waters analysis, Form 2 of 2 contains the jurisdictional waters analysis.

Isolated coordination with the EPA and USACE Isolated Waters was initiated on October 17, 2019, and considered complete on November 7, 2019, with no comments provided to SAC-RDE.