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): September 21, 2016

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 2; SAC # 2016-00860; Otis Elevator Tract

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
State: South Carolina   County/parish/borough: Florence
City: Florence
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 34.239° N, Long. -79.792° W.
Universal Transverse Mercator: NAD 83
Name of nearest waterbody: Unnamed Tributary of High Hill Creek
Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Great Pee Dee River
Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): Middle Pee Dee HUC: 03040201_07
☐ 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: September 15, 2016
☐ Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
There are no “navigable waters of the U.S.” within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]
☐ Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
☐ Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. Explain: .

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
There are “waters of the U.S.” within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.
   a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):  
      ☐ TNWs, including territorial seas
      ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
      ☒ Relatively permanent 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 U.S. in the review area:
      Non-wetland waters: 902 linear feet: 8 width (ft) and/or  0.24 acres. 
      Wetlands: 0.24 acres.

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

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³ [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: Three non-jurisdictional ditches are located on-site. Based on a review of site photos submitted by the agent,

---

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.
aerial photographs, NWIs, USGS topo maps and data sheets it was determined that these ditches were excavated out of uplands and drain only uplands.

Data sheets and site photos submitted by the agent reveal that an area located to the south west in a forested portion of the site that was mapped Palustrine forest lacks indicators of hydrology and contains soils with high chroma and value.

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: Great Pee Dee River.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: Report No. 11 of the 1977 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Charleston District Navigability Study presently classifies the Great Pee Dee River as a "navigable water of the U.S." between its mouth at Winyah Bay (R.M. 0) near Georgetown, SC to Cheraw, SC (R.M. 165). The recommended practical limit of navigation is at Blewett Falls Dam (R.M. 188.2)

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:
- Relationship with TNW:
  - [ ] Tributary flows directly into TNW.
  - [ ] Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering 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 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
  - Gravel
  - Bedrock
  - Vegetation. Type/ % cover:
  - Other. Explain: 

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

(c) Flow:

- Tributary provides for: Pick List
- Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List
- Describe flow regime: 

- Other information on duration and volume: 

- Surface flow is: Pick List. Characteristics: 

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

- Tributary has (check all that apply):
  - Bed and banks
  - OHWM\textsuperscript{6} (check all indicators that apply):
    - the presence of litter and debris
    - the presence of wrack line
    - destruction of terrestrial vegetation
    - sediment sorting
    - scour
    - multiple observed or predicted flow events
    - abrupt change in plant community
    - other (list): 
  - Discontinuous OHWM.\textsuperscript{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:
    - survey to available datum;
    - physical markings;
    - vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
    - other (list):

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 environment-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: 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: F.
☐ Ecological connection. Explain: .
☐ Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: .
(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW
Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW.
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
Flow is from: Pick List.
Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the Pick List floodplain.

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

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):
☐ Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width): .
☐ Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain: .
☐ Habitat for:
☐ Federally Listed species. Explain findings: .
☐ Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings: .
☐ Other environment-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>Wetland 1</th>
<th>Wetland 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</td>
<td>Size (in acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</td>
<td>Size (in acres)</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: The tributary was determined to be a RPW with perennial flow by review of aerial photographs,
Florence County LiDAR, site photos, NWI and USGS topographic maps. Aerial photos depict a well-defined channel with uninterrupted flow into High Hill Creek. The USGS topographic maps depict a low lying drainage area bisected by a solid blue line feature. A solid blue line is the symbol for a tributary with perennial flow. Florence County LiDAR depicts low elevations and a defined channel. Site photos submitted by the agent reveal a defined channel located within wetlands, with a firm sandy bottom clear of vegetation and debris, point bar deposition and the presence of iron oxidizing bacteria suggesting that this feature is recharged by ground water. NWIs depict the location of the pRPW as saturated palustrine scrub shrub that has been partially ditched or drained. Additionally this feature was originally determined to be a pRPW in approved JD 2009-01256 issued on April 28, 2010. Based on the previously mentioned evidence, this perennial RPW was determined to have flow at least 90% of the year under normal conditions.

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: 902 linear feet 8 width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.

3. Non-RPWs8 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.

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.
- 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: Based on a review of aerial photographs, Florence County LiDAR, site photos and data sheets submitted by the agent, USGS topographic maps, and NWIs wetlands on site are contiguous and abutt the pRPW. NWIs depict the wetlands as directly abutting the pRPW. USGS topo maps depict the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area bisected by a soils blue line feature. Florence County LiDAR depicts the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area bisected by a defined linear feature. Data sheets and site photos submitted by the agent depict the wetlands as contiguous and abutting the pRPW. Aerial photographs do not depict any natural or man-made barriers located between the pRPW and the wetlands on-site that would disrupt the physical, chemical, and/or biological connection between the two. Based on the previously mentioned evidence, wetlands on-site were determined to abutt the perennial RPW.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 0.24 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:

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

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area:

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.9
- As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

---

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

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

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination: .

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

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): Three non-jurisdictional ditches determined to have been excavated out of uplands and to drain only uplands.

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: The site is depicted on the survey plat submitted by S&ME, prepared by Nesbitt Surveying Company, Inc., last revised on September 16, 2016, and titled "WETLANDS SURVEY / OF THE OTIS ELEVATOR PLAT LOCATED NORTH OF FLORENCE, FLORENCE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, BEING THE PROPERTY SHOWN AS / TAX PARCEL NUMBER 00120-01-058, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED IN DEED BOOK B-364, PAGE 1593. SURVEYED FOR: / OTIS ELEVATOR". .
☒ 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: .

18 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.

U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:

USGS NHĐ data.

USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.

U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: Florence West Quad; USGS topographic survey information within Florence west quad depicts the project area as a combination of forested and developed uplands. A solid blue line feature is depicted within a low lying drainage area running along the northwest project boundary before it makes a sharp turn and bisects the center of the tract. The sinuous portion of this feature located within the naturally lowlying area was determined to be a pRPW. The non-sinuous portion of the feature bisecting the center of the project area was determined to be an upland excavated non-jurisdictional ditch.

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Florence County Soil Survey Sheets 5; According to the Soil Survey of Florence County, five soil mapping units are contained within the project boundary. The most common soil type is Norfolk loamy sand comprising approximately 48% of the project area. Norfolk loamy sand is described as a well drained non-hydric soil containing inclusions of Pantego, Rains, and Coxville. The remainder of the site is comprised of a combination of coxville fine sandy loam, Duplin and Exum soils, Goldsboro loamy sand, and Varina loamy fine sand. Coxville fine sandy loam is a poorly drained all hydric soil. Duplin and Exum soils are described as moderately well drained and non-hydric. Goldsboro is a moderately well drained non-hydric soil containing inclusions of Coxville, Pantego, and Rains. Varina loamy fine sand is a well drained non-hydric soil that contains inclusions of Pantego and Coxville.

National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: U42, PFO1/Ad, PSSI/3Bd and PFO1B; The project area is comprised of a combinatin of uplands and palustrine wetlands, including saturated and/or temporarily flooded palustrine forest, and scrub shrub. Wetlands and RPWs on site are located in an area mapped as palustrine on NWIs.

State/Local wetland inventory map(s):

FEMA/FIRM maps:

100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)

Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Florence County Aerial Index 99:11227:46 and SCDNR 2006.

or Other (Name & Date): Site photos submitted by the agent taken on 3/22/2016.


Applicable/supporting case law:

Applicable/supporting scientific literature:

Other information (please specify): Florence County LiDAR with Hillshade Overlay reveals the location of the pRPWs onsite as well as the non-jurisdictional ditches.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: This form addresses a 92 acre tract that contains 902 linear feet of pRPW and 0.24 acres of jurisdictional freshwater wetlands abutting the pRPW. The site also contains approximately 223 linear feet of pRPW and 0.05 acres of abutting wetlands (addressed on Basis Form 2 of 2). The tributary that is the subject of this form was determined to be a RPW with perennial flow by review of Florence County LiDAR, site photos, NWIs and USGS topographic maps. The USGS topographic maps depict a low lying drainage area bisected by a solid blue line feature. A solid blue line is the symbol for a tributary with perennial flow on a USGS topo map. Florence County LiDAR depicts low elevations and a defined channel that flows uninterrupted into High Hill Creek. Site photos submitted by the agent reveal a defined channel located within wetlands, with a firm sandy bottom clear of vegetation and debris, point bar deposition and the presence of iron oxidizing bacteria suggesting that this feature is recharged by ground water. NWIs depict the location of the pRPW as saturated palustrine scrub shrub that has been partially ditched or drained. Additionally this feature was orginally determined to be a pRPW in approved JD 2009-01256 issued on April 28, 2010. Wetlands on-site were verified using a combination of data sheets, site photos, aerial photographs, NWIs, USGS topo maps and Florence County LiDAR. NWIs depict the wetlands as directly abutting the pRPW. USGS topo maps depict the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area. Florence County LiDAR depicts the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area bisected by a defined linear feature. Data sheets and site photos submitted by the agent depict the wetlands as contiguous and abutting the pRPW, as well as, containing hydric soils and oxidized rhizospheres. Aerial photographs do not depict any natural or man-made barriers located between the pRPW and the wetlands on-site that would disrupt the physical, chemical, and/or biological connection between the two.
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):** September 21, 2016

B. **DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** JD Form 2 of 2; SAC # 2016-00860; Otis Elevator Tract

C. **PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**
   - **State:** South Carolina  
   - **County/parish/borough:** Florence  
   - **City:** Florence  
   - **Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format):** Lat. 34.239° N, Long. -79.792° W.  
   - **Universal Transverse Mercator:** NAD 83  
   - **Name of nearest waterbody:** Unnamed Tributary of High Hill Creek  
   - **Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows:** Great Pee Dee River
   - **Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC):** Middle Pee Dee HUC: 03040201_07
   - **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):**
   - [x] Office (Desk) Determination. Date: September 15, 2016
   - [ ] Field Determination. Date(s):

**SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

A. **RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.**

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

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

B. **CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.**

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

   1. **Waters of the U.S.**
      a. **Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):**
         - [ ] TNWs, including territorial seas
         - [ ] Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
         - [ ] Relatively permanent waters (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: 223 linear feet: 6 width (ft) and/or 0.05 acres.
         - Wetlands: 0.05 acres.

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

   2. **Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):**
      - [ ] [Including potentially jurisdictional features that upon assessment are NOT waters or wetlands]

---

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: Three non-jurisdictional ditches and one area mapped palustrine on NWIs are located on-site and are addressed on Basis Form 1 of 2.

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: Great Pee Dee River.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: Report No. 11 of the 1977 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Charleston District Navigability Study presently classifies the Great Pee Dee River as a "navigable water of the U.S." between its mouth at Winyah Bay (R.M. 0) near Georgetown, SC to Cheraw, SC (R.M. 165). The recommended practical limit of navigation is at Blewett Falls Dam (R.M. 188.2)

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”:

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

This section summarizes information regarding characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under Rapanos have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are “relatively permanent waters” (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

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

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

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

   (i) General Area Conditions:

   Watershed size: Pick List
   Drainage area: Pick List
   Average annual rainfall: inches
   Average annual snowfall: inches

   (ii) Physical Characteristics:

   (a) Relationship with TNW:

   □ Tributary flows directly into TNW.
   □ Tributary flows through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.

   Project waters are Pick List river miles from TNW.
   Project waters are Pick List river miles from RPW.

---

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

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

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

- Tributary is: □ Natural

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

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):
- Silts
- sands
- Cobbles
- gravel
- Bedrock
- Vegetation. Type% cover:
- Other. Explain: .

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain: .
Tributary geometry: Pick List.  □
Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) Flow:
Tributary provides for: Pick List
Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: Pick List
Describe flow regime: .
Other information on duration and volume: .
Subsurface flow: Unknown. Explain findings: .
Dye (or other) test performed: .

Tributary has (check all that apply):
- Bed and banks
- OHWM6 (check all indicators that apply):
  □ clear, natural line impressed on the bank
  □ changes in the character of soil
  □ shelving
  □ vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
  □ leaf litter disturbed or washed away
  □ sediment deposition
  □ water staining
  □ other (list):
- Discontinuous OHWM.7 Explain: .

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):
- High Tide Line indicated by: □
  □ Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
  □ survey to available datum;
  □ physical markings;
  □ vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
- other (list):

(iii) Chemical Characteristics:

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.
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: 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: F. 
  - Ecological connection. Explain: 
  - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain: 

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are Pick List river miles from TNW. 
Project waters are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW. 
Flow is from: Pick List. 

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the Pick List floodplain.

(ii) Chemical Characteristics:

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

Identify specific pollutants, if known: 

(iii) Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):

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

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List 
Approximately ( ) acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.
For each wetland, specify the following:

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

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

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

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

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the Rapanos Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

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

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

2. Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands; then go to Section III.D: .

3. Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands; then go to Section III.D: .

Documentation for the Record only: Significant nexus findings for seasonal RPWs and/or wetlands abutting seasonal RPWs: .

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:
   - TNWs: linear feet width (ft), or, acres.
   - Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**
   - Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: The tributary was determined to be a RPW with perennial flow by review of aerial photographs,
Florence County LiDAR, site photos, NWIs and USGS topographic maps. Aerial photos depict a well-defined channel with uninterrupted flow into an adjacent pRPW and then into High Hill Creek. The USGS topographic maps depict a low lying drainage area, Florence County LiDAR depicts low elevations and a defined channel. Site photos submitted by the agent reveal a defined channel located within wetlands, with a firm sandy bottom clear of vegetation and debris, point bar deposition and the presence of iron oxidizing bacteria suggesting that this feature is recharged by ground water. NWIs depict the location of the pRPW as saturated palustrine scrub shrub that has been partially ditched or drained. Based on the previously mentioned evidence, this perennial RPW was determined to have flow at least 90% of the year under normal conditions.

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: 223 linear feet 6 width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
- Identify type(s) of waters: .

3. Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

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

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

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

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

- Wetlands directly abutting an RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.

Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: Based on a review of aerial photographs, Florence County LiDAR, site photos and data sheets submitted by the agent, USGS topographic maps, and NWIs wetlands on site are contiguous and abutt the pRPW. NWIs depict the wetlands as directly abutting the pRPW. USGS topo maps depict the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area bisected by a soils blue line feature. Florence County LiDAR depicts the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area bisected by a defined linear feature. Data sheets and site photos submitted by the agent depict the wetlands as contiguous and abutting the pRPW. Aerial photographs do not depict any natural or man-made barriers located between the pRPW and the wetlands on-site that would disrupt the physical, chemical, and/or biological connection between the two. Based on the previously mentioned evidence, wetlands on-site were determined to abutt the perennial RPW .

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: 0.05 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.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

---

8See Footnote # 3.
9To 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).

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.

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: The site is depicted on the survey plat submitted by S&ME, prepared by Nesbitt Surveying Company, Inc., last revised on August 19, 2016, and titled "WETLANDS SURVEY / OF THE OTIS ELEVATOR PLAT LOCATED NORTH OF FLORENCE, FLORENCE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, BEING THE PROPERTY SHOWN AS / TAX PARCEL NUMBER 00120-01-058, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED IN DEED BOOK B-364, PAGE 1593. SURVEYED FOR: / OTIS ELEVATOR". .
☒ 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: .

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.
Florence west quad depicts the project area as a combination of forested and developed uplands. A solid blue line feature is depicted within a low lying drainage area running along the northwest project boundary before it makes a sharp turn and bisects the center of the tract. The sinuous portion of this feature located within the naturally low-lying area was determined to be a pRPW. The non-sinuous portion of the feature bisecting the center of the project area was determined to be an upland excavated non-jurisdictional ditch. The pRPW and wetlands addressed on this form are depicted as a low lying drainage area.

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Florence County Soil Survey Sheets 5. According to the Soil Survey of Florence County, five soil mapping units are contained within the project boundary. The most common soil type is Norfolk loamy sand comprising approximately 48% of the project area. Norfolk loamy sand is described as a well drained non-hydric soil containing inclusions of Pantego, Rains, and Coxville. The remainder of the site is comprised of a combination of coxville fine sandy loam, Duplin and Exum soils, Goldsboro loamy sand, and Varina loamy fine sand. Coxville fine sandy loam is a poorly drained all hydric soil. Duplin and Exum soils are described as moderately well drained and non-hydric. Goldsboro is a moderately well drained non-hydric soil containing inclusions of Coxville, Pantego, and Rains. Varina loamy fine sand is a well drained non-hydric soil that contains inclusions of Pantego and Coxville.

National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: U42, PFO1/4Ad, PSS1/3Bd and PFO1B; The project area is comprised of a combination of uplands and palustrine wetlands, including saturated and/or temporarily flooded palustrine forest, and scrub shrub. Wetlands and RPWs on site are located in an area mapped as palustrine on NWIs.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: This form addresses a 92 acre tract that contains 223 linear feet of pRPW and 0.05 acres of jurisdictional freshwater wetlands abutting the pRPW. The site also contains approximately 902 linear feet of pRPW and 0.24 acres of abutting wetlands (addressed on Basis Form 1 of 2). The tributary was determined to be a RPW with perennial flow by review of aerial photographs, Florence County LiDAR, site photos, NWIs and USGS topographic maps. Aerial photos depict a well-defined channel with uninterrupted flow into an adjacent pRPW and then into High Hill Creek. The USGS topographic maps depict a low lying drainage area. Florence County LiDAR depicts low elevations and a defined channel. Site photos submitted by the agent reveal a defined channel located within wetlands, with a firm sandy bottom clear of vegetation and debris, point bar deposition and the presence of iron oxidizing bacteria suggesting that this feature is recharged by ground water. NWIs depict the location of the pRPW as saturated palustrine scrub shrub that has been partially ditched or drained. Wetlands on-site were verified using a combination of data sheets, site photos, aerial photographs, NWIs, USGS topo maps and Florence County LiDAR. NWIs depict the wetlands as directly abutting the pRPW. USGS topo maps depict the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area. Florence County LiDAR depicts the location of the delineated wetlands as a naturally low lying drainage area bisected by a defined linear feature. Data sheets and site photos submitted by the agent depict the wetlands as contiguous and abutting the pRPW, as well as, containing hydric soils and oxidized rhizospheres. Aerial photographs do not depict any natural or man-made barriers located between the pRPW and the wetlands on-site that would disrupt the physical, chemical, and/or biological connection between the two.