

**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 26, 2022

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** JD Form 1 of 3; SAC-2022-00076 White Tract 1

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: Charleston County City: Awendaw

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 32.95540 °, Long. -79.66936 °.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW)

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: N/A

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 3050209

☒ 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): June 14, 2022

**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):<sup>1</sup>**

- ☐ TNWs, including territorial seas
- ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- ☐ Relatively permanent waters<sup>2</sup> (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
- ☐ Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

**b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:**

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: acres.

**c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: **Pick List****

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

**2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):<sup>3</sup>**

- ☒ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: **The project review area includes five wetlands that were determined to be isolated. Wetland 5 appears to continue offsite to the north, but based on a review of LiDAR and aerial photographs, the wetland appears to be surrounded by uplands and sits lower in the landscape than the surrounding uplands. It also appears that no ditches or swales come out of the wetland that would provide a potential surface hydrologic connection from the wetland to a water of the U.S. Wetlands 8 and 9 are located on the western side of the project review area. The wetlands continue to**

<sup>1</sup> Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

the approximate property boundary and dirt road, but based on observations made during the site visit, Wetlands 8 and 9 do not continue across the property boundary and dirt road onto the adjacent property. Wetlands 8 and 9 are surrounded by uplands and sit lower in the landscape than surrounding wetlands. No ditches or swales were observed coming out of these wetlands that would provide a potential surface hydrologic connection from the wetlands to a water of the U.S. Wetland 7 is located within the project review area and is surrounded by uplands and sit lower in the landscape than the surrounding uplands. No ditches or swales were observed coming out of the wetlands that would provide a potential surface hydrologic connection from the wetland to a water of the U.S. Wetland 6 is located towards the middle of the project review area along Bulls Island Road. However, Wetland 6 ends before reaching the road and does not continue across the road. Wetland 6 is surrounded by uplands and there are no ditches or swales were observed coming out of the wetland that would provide a potential surface hydrologic connection from the wetland to a water of the U.S. In addition, for Wetlands 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, there also appears to be no subsurface hydrologic connection, and no physical, chemical, or biological connection, to waters of the US. Therefore, Wetlands 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were determined to be isolated, non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA.

### **SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS**

#### **A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs**

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over TNWs and wetlands adjacent to TNWs. If the aquatic resource is a TNW, complete Section III.A.1 and Section III.D.1. only; if the aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

##### **1. TNW**

Identify TNW: \_\_\_\_\_.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: \_\_\_\_\_.

##### **2. Wetland adjacent to TNW**

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”: \_\_\_\_\_.

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

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

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

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

If the waterbody<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

(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<sup>5</sup>: .  
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):**

- |                                            |                                                    |                                   |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts             | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles           | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock           | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: |                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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):**

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

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

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

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

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

- |                                                                    |                                                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by:              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by:            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects      | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum;                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings;                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics         | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges                              |                                                                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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, 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:

|                              |                        |                              |                        |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| <u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u> | <u>Size (in acres)</u> | <u>Directly abuts? (Y/N)</u> | <u>Size (in acres)</u> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|

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: .

**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<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>**

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).

**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):<sup>10</sup>**

- ☐ which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.

<sup>8</sup>See Footnote # 3.

<sup>9</sup>To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

<sup>10</sup>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.

- ☐ 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: Wetland 5: 0.08 acre; Wetland 6: 0.41 acre; Wetland 7: 0.16 acres; Wetland 8: 0.91 acre; Wetland 9: 0.50 acre: Total: 2.06 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: Passarella & Associates.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - ☐ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
  - ☐ Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- ☐ Corps navigable waters’ study: .
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: .
  - ☐ USGS NHD data.
  - ☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: .
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Seewee Complex, Chipley loamy fine sand
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: PSS1/4A, PFO4/SS1A
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☐ Photographs: ☐ Aerial (Name & Date): .
  - or ☐ Other (Name & Date): .
- ☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .

☒ Other information (please specify):LiDAR.

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** The project review areas includes five wetlands (Wetlands 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9) that were determined to be isolated and non-jurisdictional; therefore, they are not regulated by Section 404 of the CWA. The jurisdictional status of the remaining wetlands and aquatic resources also located within the project review area are discussed on the remaining Forms.

**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 26, 2022

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** JD Form 2 of 3; SAC-2022-00076 White Tract 1

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: Charleston County City: Awendaw

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 32.95540 °, Long. -79.66936 °.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW)

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03050209

☒ 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): June 14, 2022

**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 and are not** "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):<sup>1</sup>**

- ☐ TNWs, including territorial seas
- ☐ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- ☐ Relatively permanent waters<sup>2</sup> (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☒ Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- ☐ Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
- ☐ Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

**b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:**

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: Wetland 1: 7.97 acres.

**c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

**2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):<sup>3</sup>**

☒ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: The project review area includes a pond and two linear conveyances. The pond is surrounded by uplands and appears to have been excavated from uplands. The pond consists of open waters and does not meet the three parameters of a wetland. Based on a review of Google Earth imagery, it appears that the pond was constructed in 2015. While the purpose of the excavation of the pond is unknown, it may have been excavated for the purpose of borrow material as no areas of visible fill are present within the project review area. As stated in the Preamble

<sup>1</sup> Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

to the November 13, 1986, Regulations found on page 41217 (Federal Register vol. 51 No. 219) "waterfilled depressions created in dry land incidental to construction activity and pits excavated in dry land for the purpose of obtaining fill, sand, or gravel unless and until the construction or excavation operation is abandoned and resulting body of water meets the definition of waters of the United States" are generally not considered waters of the U.S. The project review area also includes two linear features. One linear feature flows out of the pond and into Wetland 1. The second linear conveyance flows out of Wetland 2 and flows through uplands and then offsite. Both linear conveyances were excavated from uplands, do not have a defined bed and bank, do not have an OHW mark, and have no relatively permanent flow. Therefore, the pond and two linear conveyances are non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA.

### **SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS**

#### **A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs**

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over TNWs and wetlands adjacent to TNWs. If the aquatic resource is a TNW, complete Section III.A.1 and Section III.D.1. only; if the aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

##### **1. TNW**

Identify TNW: \_\_\_\_\_.

Summarize rationale supporting determination: \_\_\_\_\_.

##### **2. Wetland adjacent to TNW**

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent": \_\_\_\_\_.

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

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

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

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

If the waterbody<sup>4</sup> 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.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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<sup>5</sup>: .  
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):**

|                                            |                                                      |                                   |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts             | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles           | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock           | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: . |                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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):

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

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

|                                                                    |                                                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by:              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by:            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects      | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum;                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings;                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics         | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |

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

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

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

- ☐ 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, 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:

Directly abuts? (Y/N)

Size (in acres)

Directly abuts? (Y/N)

Size (in acres)

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: .

### 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: **Offsite Tributary 1, which is partially located within the project review area of the White Tract 2, SAC-2022-00159. The Offsite Tributary 1 was determined to be a perennial RPW in the Approved Jurisdictional Determination, SAC-2022-00159, which was issued on September 22, 2022. As part of the site visit for SAC-2022-00159, Offsite Tributary 1 was observed to have flowing water at the time of the site visit. Additionally, the tributary is visible in LiDAR and is shown as a blue line tributary on topographic maps.**

- ☐ 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<sup>8</sup> 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: **Onsite Wetland 1 continues offsite to the southeast and is part of a larger wetland system that flows partially through White Tract 2, SAC-2022-00159. The offsite wetland system is contiguous with Offsite Tributary 1. The offsite wetland system was determined to abut the Offsite Tributary 1 in Approved Jurisdictional Wetland determination, SAC-2022-00159, that was issued on September 22, 2022.**

- ☐ 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: **7.97** 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.<sup>9</sup>**

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).

**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):<sup>10</sup>**

<sup>8</sup>See Footnote # 3.

<sup>9</sup> To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

- ☐ 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): The project review area includes a pond and two linear conveyances. The pond is surrounded by uplands and appears to have been excavated from uplands. The pond consists of open waters and does not meet the three parameters of a wetland. Based on a review of Google Earth imagery, it appears that the pond was constructed in 2015. While the purpose of the excavation of the pond is unknown, it may have been excavated for the purpose of borrow material as no areas of visible fill are present within the project review area. As stated in the Preamble to the November 13, 1986, Regulations found on page 41217 (Federal Register vol. 51 No. 219) "waterfilled depressions created in dry land incidental to construction activity and pits excavated in dry land for the purpose of obtaining fill, sand, or gravel unless and until the construction or excavation operation is abandoned and resulting body of water meets the definition of waters of the United States" are generally not considered waters of the U.S. The project review area also includes two linear features. One linear feature flows out of the pond and into Wetland 1. The second linear conveyance flows out of Wetland 2 and flows through uplands and then offsite. Both linear conveyances were excavated from uplands, do not have a defined bed and bank, do not have an OHW mark, and have no relatively permanent flow. Therefore, the pond and two linear conveyances are non-jurisdictional and not subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA.**

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: \_\_\_\_\_

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: Passarella & Associates.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
- ☐ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.

---

<sup>10</sup> 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*.

- ☐ Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- ☐ Corps navigable waters' study: .
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: .
- ☐ USGS NHD data.
- ☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: .
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Seewee Complex, Chipley loamy fine sand
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: PSS1/4A, PFO4/SS1A
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☐ Photographs: ☐ Aerial (Name & Date): .
- or ☐ Other (Name & Date): .
- ☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .
- ☒ Other information (please specify): LiDAR.

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** The project review area includes one wetland, Wetland 1, that was determined to be jurisdictional and subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA. The project review area also includes a pond and two linear conveyances that were determined to be non-jurisdictional and not regulated under Section 404 of the CWA. The jurisdictional status of the remaining wetlands are discussed on the other forms.

**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 26, 2022

**B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER:** JD Form 3 of 3; SAC-2022-00076 White Tract 1

**C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

State: South Carolina County/parish/borough: Charleston County City: Awendaw

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 32.95540 °, Long. -79.66936 °.

Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW)

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW)

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03050209

☒ 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): June 14, 2022

**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):<sup>1</sup>**

☐ TNWs, including territorial seas

☒ Wetlands adjacent to TNWs

☐ Relatively permanent waters<sup>2</sup> (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

☐ Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

☐ Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

☐ Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

☐ Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs

☐ Impoundments of jurisdictional waters

☐ Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

**b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:**

Non-wetland waters: linear feet: width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: Wetland 2: 2.37 acres; Wetland 3: 2.99 acres; Wetland 4: 0.2 acre: Total: 5.56 acres

**c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: 1987 Delineation Manual**

Elevation of established OHWM (if known): .

**2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):<sup>3</sup>**

☐

**SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS**

**A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs**

<sup>1</sup> Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

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: Tidal Impoundment of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW)

Summarize rationale supporting determination: The AIWW is a tidal water body, a Section 10 water, and is therefore a TNW. Additionally, the AIWW is a Corps Federal Navigation project channel Based on a review of historic aerial photographs, it appears that between 1957 and 1983 a dike/embankment was constructed to create a tidal impoundment (Offsite Tidal Impoundment). Prior to the impoundment construction, the tidal creek was subject to the ebb and flow of the tide and was a Section 10 water. In addition, based on a review of Google Earth imagery dated 2018, a water control structure appears to be present in the dike/embankment that potentially allows for tidal waters to flow into the impoundment, which means the impoundment is a Section 10 water. Additionally, as stated in 33 CFR. 329.2, “Navigable waters of the United States are those waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. A determination of navigability, once made, applies laterally over the entire surface of the waterbody, and is not extinguished by later actions or events which impede or destroy navigable capacity.” Therefore, based on this information, the tidal impoundment is a Section 10 water and therefore a TNW.

2. Wetland adjacent to TNW

Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”: Onsite Wetland 3 continues offsite to the northeast of the project review area. Based on a review of LiDAR, the offsite wetland flows into an offsite linear conveyance (Offsite Linear Conveyance 1). Onsite Wetlands 2 and 4 also continue offsite to the east of the project review area as one wetland that also appears to flow into Offsite Linear Conveyance 1. Offsite Linear Conveyance 1 appears to turn south, then to the east and back to the south again where continues until it discharges into Offsite Tidal Impoundment 1. Therefore, water from Onsite Wetlands 2, 3 and 4 are considered to be adjacent to Offsite Tidal Impoundment 1, as well as the AIWW, which are both TNWs.

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<sup>4</sup> 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:

<sup>4</sup> Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

(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<sup>5</sup>: .  
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):

|                                            |                                                      |                                   |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts             | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles           | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock           | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: . |                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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):

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

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

☐ High Tide Line indicated by:            ☐ Mean High Water Mark indicated by:

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

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

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

- |                                                                    |                                                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects      | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum;                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings;                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics         | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges                              |                                                                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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, 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:

Directly abuts? (Y/N)

Size (in acres)

Directly abuts? (Y/N)

Size (in acres)

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: .

**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: **Wetland 2: 2.37 acres; Wetland 3: 2.99 acres; Wetland 4: 0.2 acre; Total: 5.56 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<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>**

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).

**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):<sup>10</sup>**

- ☐ which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.

<sup>8</sup>See Footnote # 3.

<sup>9</sup>To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

<sup>10</sup>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.

- ☐ 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:

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: Passarella & Associates.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
  - ☐ Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
  - ☐ Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared by the Corps: .
- ☐ Corps navigable waters’ study: .
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas: .
  - ☐ USGS NHD data.
  - ☐ USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: .
- ☒ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Seewee Complex, Chipley loamy fine sand
- ☒ National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: PSS1/4A, PFO4/SS1A
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory map(s): .
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps: .
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- ☐ Photographs: ☐ Aerial (Name & Date): .
  - or ☐ Other (Name & Date): .
- ☐ Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law: .
- ☐ Applicable/supporting scientific literature: .

☒ Other information (please specify):LiDAR.

**B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:** The project review areas includes Wetlands 2, 3 and 4 which were determined to be jurisdictional and subject to regulation under Section 404 of the CWA. The jurisdictional status of the remaining wetlands and features present within the project review area are discussed on the other Forms.