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.

A.	REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR AFFROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD); January 10, 2012
B.	DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: JD Form 1 of 1; SAC # 2011-1117-1JW Hardeeville Wilco Travel Plaza
C.	PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: State: South Carolina
D.	REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): ☐ Office (Desk) Determination. Date: January 6, 2012 ☐ Field Determination. Date(s):
	CTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
	re Are no "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the ew 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:
В.	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]

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): ¹					
	TNWs, including territorial seas				
	Wetlands adjacent to TNWs				
	Relatively permanent waters ² (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. Identi	ify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:				

width (ft) and/or

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

linear feet:

acres.

Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

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

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: There is a non-jurisdictional swale that is described on the plat as a non-jurisdictional ditch. This feature was constructed in uplands to convey water from an asphalt parking lot to an offsite conveyance that parallels I-95.

acres.

Non-wetland waters:

Wetlands:

1. Waters of the U.S.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

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

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

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

ı.	TNW Identify TNW:	
	Summarize rationale supporting determination: .	
2.	Wetland adjacent to TNW Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is "adjacent":	

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) General Area Conditions:

	Watershed size: I	Pick List ;
	Drainage area: P	ick List
	Average annual rainfall:	inches
	Average annual snowfall	: inches
(ii)	Physical Characteristic	s:
	(a) Relationship with T	
	☐ Tributary flows	directly into TNW.
	Tributary flows	through Pick List tributaries before entering TNW.
	Project waters are I	Pick List river miles from TNW.
	Project waters are I	Pick List river miles from RPW.
	Project waters are I	Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.
	Project waters are I	Pick List aerial (straight) miles from RPW.
	Project waters cross	s or serve as state boundaries. Explain: .
	Identify flow route t	to TNW ⁵ :
	Tributary stream ord	der, if known:

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

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

	(b)	General Tributary C	Characteristics (check all that apply	<u>):</u>		
		Tributary is:	Natural	_		
		•	Artificial (man-made). Explain	n: .		
			Manipulated (man-altered). E			
		Tributary propertie	es with respect to top of bank (estir	nate):		
		Average width				
		Average depth				
			slopes: Pick List.			
		Tiverage side s	Topes. Tren Else			
		Primary tributary su	abstrate composition (check all that	annly).		
		Silts	Sands	appij).	☐ Concrete	
		Cobbles	Gravel		Muck	
		Bedrock	☐ Vegetation. Type/%	cover.	Widek	
		Other. Exp		cover.		
		☐ Oulci. Exp	iani			
		Tributary condition	/stability [e.g., highly eroding, slou	ahina hanka	1 Evoluin	
			le/pool complexes. Explain:	igning banks	j. Explain	
		Tributary geometry		•		
			(approximate average slope):	%		
		Tributary gradient (approximate average stope):	%0		
	(a)	Elova				
	(c)	Flow:	form Dialo I ind			
		Tributary provides		yvoor: Diel z	T ist	
		Describe flow	umber of flow events in review area	a year. Fick	List	
			regime: on duration and volume:			
		Other information c	on duration and volume: .			
		Surface flowing Die	ck List. Characteristics:			
		Surface flow is. I ic	K List. Characteristics.			
		Subsurface flow: Pi	ick List. Explain findings: .			
			ner) test performed:			
		□ byc (or our	ici) test periorined.			
		Tributary has (chec	k all that apply):			
		Bed and ba				
			check all indicators that apply):			
			natural line impressed on the bank	☐ the nre	sence of litter and debris	
			es in the character of soil		ction of terrestrial vegetation	
		shelvir			sence of wrack line	
			tion matted down, bent, or absent		ent sorting	
			ter disturbed or washed away	scour	ant sorting	
				_	la absorred or mudiated florre arrents	
			ent deposition staining		le observed or predicted flow events change in plant community	
				🗀 абгирі	change in plant community	
		other (
		☐ Discontinu	ous OHWM. ⁷ Explain:	•		
		TCC	1 010004	1 . 1 .		
					ent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that appl	y):
			E Line indicated by:		Water Mark indicated by:	
			scum line along shore objects		o available datum;	
			ell or debris deposits (foreshore)		markings;	
			al markings/characteristics	□ vegetation	on lines/changes in vegetation types.	
		tidal g				
		other (list):			
····	C.	1.01				
(iii)		emical Characteristi		.1 (*1		
	Cha	•	.g., water color is clear, discolored,	ony mm; w	ater quality; general watershed characteristi	cs, etc.).
	T 1	Explain: .				
	Ider	ntify specific pollutar	its, ii known:			

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

⁷Ibid.

	(iv)	Riparian corrid Wetland fringe Habitat for: Federally L Fish/spawn Other envir	eristics. Channel supports (check all that apply): or. Characteristics (type, average width): Characteristics: sted species. Explain findings: areas. Explain findings: onmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: dlife diversity. Explain findings:	
2.	Cha	acteristics of wetla	nds adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW	
	(i)	Wetland qu	d Characteristics:	
		(b) General Flow Flow is: Pick l	<u>telationship with Non-TNW</u> : _ist. Explain:	
		Surface flow is Characteris		
			v: Pick List. Explain findings: other) test performed:	
		☐ Directly abu ☐ Not directly ☐ Discret ☐ Ecolog		
		Project waters : Flow is from: I	s are Pick List river miles from TNW. are Pick List aerial (straight) miles from TNW.	
	(ii)	Chemical Characte Characterize wetland characteristics; Identify specific pol	l system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watersh etc.). Explain:	ied
	(iii)	Riparian buffer Vegetation type Habitat for: Federally L Fish/spawn Other envir	eristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply): Characteristics (type, average width): //percent cover. Explain: sted species. Explain findings: areas. Explain findings: onmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings: dlife diversity. Explain findings:	
3.	Cha		tlands adjacent to the tributary (if any) considered in the cumulative analysis: Pick List) 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 <i>Rapanos</i> Guidance aliscussed 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 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 fit 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 capacity 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?	to sh and arbon that		
	Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented by the contract of	ıted		
	Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs. findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D:	Explain		
	2. Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly TNWs. Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all 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 presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, the Section III.D:			
	Documentation for the Record only: Significant nexus findings for seasonal RPWs and/or wetlands abutting seasonal R	PWs:		
D.	DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALTHAT APPLY):	L		
	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.			

RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that

tributary is perennial:

	☐ Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow "seasonally" (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally:
	Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply): Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft). Other non-wetland waters: acres. Identify type(s) of waters: .
3.	Non-RPWs ⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.
	Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply): Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft). Other non-wetland waters: acres. Identify type(s) of waters: .
4.	Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. ☐ Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands. ☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
	☐ Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally." Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW:
	Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.
5.	Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisidictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.
	Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.
6.	Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs. Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.
	Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.
7.	Impoundments of jurisdictional waters. As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional. Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below). Explain:
SUC	DLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, GRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY CH 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:

E.

⁸See Footnote # 3.

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

¹⁰ Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply): Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft). Other non-wetland waters: acres. Identify type(s) of waters: . Wetlands: acres.
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): There is a non-jurisdictional feature that is neither a wetland or a water of the U.S. it is a swale that was constructed in wetlands to convey water from an asphalt parking lot offsite to a linear conveyance that allels I-95.
Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the <u>sole</u> 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.
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: Britt A. Feldner at the Brigman Company Incorporated. 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: Hardeeville quad. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation: Jasper County soilsbook page 81, COOSAW. National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: U12. State/Local wetland inventory map(s): FEMA/FilRM maps: 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929) Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): 99 Aerial 11202:47. or Other (Name & Date): photos taken at ground level by the consultant dated September 14, 2011. Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter: Applicable/supporting ascientific literature: Other information (please specify): Site is 18.22 acres in size and is an existing travel plaza bounded by I-95 and US Hwy 17.
The applicant has indicated a non-jurisdictional feature on the plat that appears to be a swale that conveys stormwater from an asphalt parking lot offsite towards I-95. There is also a linear shaped borrow pit that is outside the property line and within the right of way for I-95.

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: