



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, GALVESTON DISTRICT  
2000 FORT POINT ROAD  
GALVESTON, TEXAS 77550

CESWG - RDN

28 January 2026

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime  
Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322  
(2023),<sup>1</sup> SWG-2025-00683<sup>2</sup>

BACKGROUND. An Approved Jurisdictional Determination (AJD) is a Corps document stating the presence or absence of waters of the United States on a parcel or a written statement and map identifying the limits of waters of the United States on a parcel. AJDs are clearly designated appealable actions and will include a basis of JD with the document.<sup>3</sup> AJDs are case-specific and are typically made in response to a request. AJDs are valid for a period of five years unless new information warrants revision of the determination before the expiration date or a District Engineer has identified, after public notice and comment, that specific geographic areas with rapidly changing environmental conditions merit re-verification on a more frequent basis.<sup>4</sup> For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),<sup>5</sup> the Clean Water Act (CWA) implementing regulations published by the Department of the Army in 1986 and amended in 1993 (references 2.a. and 2.b. respectively), the 2008 *Rapanos-Carabell* guidance (reference 2.c.), and other applicable guidance, relevant case law and longstanding practice, (collectively the pre-2015 regulatory regime), and the *Sackett* decision (reference 2.d.) in evaluating jurisdiction.

This Memorandum for Record (MFR) constitutes the basis of jurisdiction for a Corps AJD as defined in 33 CFR §331.2. The features addressed in this AJD were evaluated consistent with the definition of “waters of the United States” found in the pre-2015 regulatory regime and consistent with the Supreme Court’s decision in *Sackett*. This AJD did not rely on the 2023 “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States,’” as

---

<sup>1</sup> While the Supreme Court’s decision in *Sackett* had no effect on some categories of waters covered under the CWA, and no effect on any waters covered under RHA, all categories are included in this Memorandum for Record for efficiency.

<sup>2</sup> When documenting aquatic resources within the review area that are jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act (CWA), use an additional MFR and group the aquatic resources on each MFR based on the TNW, interstate water, or territorial seas that they are connected to. Be sure to provide an identifier to indicate when there are multiple MFRs associated with a single AJD request (i.e., number them 1, 2, 3, etc.).

<sup>3</sup> 33 CFR 331.2.

<sup>4</sup> Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-02.

<sup>5</sup> USACE has authority under both Section 9 and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 but for convenience, in this MFR, jurisdiction under RHA will be referred to as Section 10.

amended on 8 September 2023 (Amended 2023 Rule) because, as of the date of this decision, the Amended 2023 Rule is not applicable Texas due to litigation.

## 1. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.

- a. Provide a list of each individual feature within the review area and the jurisdictional status of each one (i.e., identify whether each feature is/is not a water of the United States and/or a navigable water of the United States).
- b. Provide a list of each individual feature within the review area and the jurisdictional status of each one (i.e., identify whether each feature is/is not a water of the United States and/or a navigable water of the United States).

Name	Size (acres)	Location		Jurisdictional Status
Wetland 1	0.15	29.894295	-95.376397	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Pond 1	0.23	29.893664	-95.378817	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional

Name	Size (Linear feet)	Location		Jurisdictional Status
<b>Ditches/Swale</b>				
Ditch 1	750	29.893882	-95.374805	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Ditch 2	160	29.893347	-95.378454	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Stream 1	7,580	29.892070	-95.383357	RPW, jurisdictional

## 2. REFERENCES.

- a. Final Rule for Regulatory Programs of the Corps of Engineers, 51 FR 41206 (November 13, 1986).
- b. Clean Water Act Regulatory Programs, 58 FR 45008 (August 25, 1993).
- c. U.S. EPA & U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in *Rapanos v. United States & Carabell v. United States* (December 2, 2008)
- d. *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023)
- e. 12 March 2025 Memorandum to the Field Between the U.S. Department of Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Concerning the Proper Implementation of "Continuous Surface Connection" Under the Definition of "Waters of the United States" Under the Clean Water Act.

3. REVIEW AREA. Approximate 87.6-acre property located approximately .17-miles north of the intersection at Gulf Bank Road and Hardy Street; located at Latitude 29.893302°, Longitude -95.380738°, Houston, Harris County, Texas.
4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. Greens Bayou
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS Stream 1 flows southeast through Halls Bayou, approximately 12.4 river miles to Greens Bayou, A TNW.
6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS<sup>6</sup>: Describe aquatic resources or other features within the review area determined to be jurisdictional in accordance with Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Include the size of each aquatic resource or other feature within the review area and how it was determined to be jurisdictional in accordance with Section 10.<sup>7</sup> N/A
7. SECTION 404 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS: Describe the aquatic resources within the review area that were found to meet the definition of waters of the United States in accordance with the pre-2015 regulatory regime and consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in *Sackett*. List each aquatic resource separately, by name, consistent with the naming convention used in section 1, above. Include a rationale for each aquatic resource, supporting that the aquatic resource meets the relevant category of "waters of the United States" in the pre-2015 regulatory regime. The rationale should also include a written description of, or reference to a map in the administrative record that shows, the lateral limits of jurisdiction for each aquatic resource, including how that limit was determined, and incorporate relevant references used. Include the size of each aquatic resource in acres or linear feet and attach and reference related figures as needed.
  - a. TNWs (a)(1): N/A

---

<sup>6</sup> 33 CFR 329.9(a) A waterbody which was navigable in its natural or improved state, or which was susceptible of reasonable improvement (as discussed in § 329.8(b) of this part) retains its character as "navigable in law" even though it is not presently used for commerce, or is presently incapable of such use because of changed conditions or the presence of obstructions.

<sup>7</sup> This MFR is not to be used to make a report of findings to support a determination that the water is a navigable water of the United States. The district must follow the procedures outlined in 33 CFR part 329.14 to make a determination that water is a navigable water of the United States subject to Section 10 of the RHA.

- b. Interstate Waters (a)(2): N/A
- c. Other Waters (a)(3): N/A
- d. Impoundments (a)(4): N/A
- e. Tributaries (a)(5): Stream 1(Halls Bayou), is a tributary with permanent flow which connects with a series of canals flowing southeast to Greens Bayou, a Traditional Navigable Water; therefore, Stream 1 meets the definition of a tributary as defined in the pre-2015 regime post *Sackett* guidance and is a water of the United States.
- f. The territorial seas (a)(6): N/A
- g. Adjacent wetlands (a)(7): N/A

## 8. NON-JURISDICTIONAL AQUATIC RESOURCES AND FEATURES

- a. Describe aquatic resources and other features within the review area identified as “generally non-jurisdictional” in the preamble to the 1986 regulations (referred to as “preamble waters”).<sup>8</sup> Include size of the aquatic resource or feature within the review area and describe how it was determined to be non-jurisdictional under the CWA as a preamble water.

### **Ponds, Pond 1 (0.23-acre):**

Pond 1 is not an impoundment of a water of the United States. Pond 1 is contained wholly within and does not extend beyond the project area boundary. Pond 1 does not have a continuous surface connection to a relatively permanent water. The 1986 preamble to 33 CFR 320-330 regulations states that for clarification it should be noted that we generally do not consider the following waters to be “waters of the United States... (C) Artificial reflecting or swimming pools or other small ornamental bodies of water created by excavating or diking dry land to retain water for primarily aesthetic reasons”. Therefore, Pond 1 is not a water of the United States and is not subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

- b. Describe aquatic resources and features within the review area identified as “generally not jurisdictional” in the *Rapanos* guidance. Include size of the aquatic

---

<sup>8</sup> 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

resource or feature within the review area and describe how it was determined to be non-jurisdictional under the CWA based on the criteria listed in the guidance.

**Ditches, Ditch 1-2 (910 Linear Feet):**

There are 2 upland cut ditches on the tract totaling approximately 910 linear feet. The drainage ditches were constructed in uplands and used to drain uplands. The drainage ditches only flow in response to precipitation events and do not have relatively permanent flow as evident in Google Earth aerial images. The ditches do not have a defined bed or bank and/or ordinary high-water mark. Therefore, Ditches 1 & 2 are not a water of the United States subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Any discharge of dredged and/or fill material into Ditches 1 & 2 does not require a Department of the Army permit.

- c. Describe aquatic resources and features identified within the review area as waste treatment systems, including treatment ponds or lagoons designed to meet the requirements of CWA. Include the size of the waste treatment system within the review area and describe how it was determined to be a waste treatment system N/A
- d. Describe aquatic resources and features within the review area determined to be prior converted cropland in accordance with the 1993 regulations (reference 2.b.). Include the size of the aquatic resource or feature within the review area and describe how it was determined to be prior converted cropland. N/A
- e. Describe aquatic resources (i.e. lakes and ponds) within the review area, which do not have a nexus to interstate or foreign commerce, and prior to the January 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," would have been jurisdictional based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule." Include the size of the aquatic resource or feature, and how it was determined to be an "isolated water" in accordance with SWANCC. N/A
- f. Describe aquatic resources and features within the review area that were determined to be non-jurisdictional because they do not meet one or more categories of waters of the United States under the pre-2015 regulatory regime consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in *Sackett* (e.g., tributaries that are non-relatively permanent waters; non-tidal wetlands that do not have a continuous surface connection to a jurisdictional water).

**Wetlands, WETLAND 1 (0.15 acres total):**

Based on data sources listed in #9, our 27 January 2026 desk review, we have determined this wetland reside in small depressional areas within the review area, that collects rainwater and is completely enclosed by elevated uplands. Based on our review, the wetland does not have any known continuous surface connection to any RPW, TNW, or impoundments of either. Therefore, in accordance with the pre-2015 regime post-Sackett and the 12 March 2025 Memorandum to the Field Between the U.S. Department of Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Concerning the Proper Implementation of "Continuous Surface Connection" Under the Definition of "Waters of the United States" Under the Clean Water Act, Wetland 1 does not meet the definition of adjacent as defined in the pre-2015 regime post Sackett guidance and are not waters of the United States subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Any discharge of dredged and/or fill material into Wetland 1 does not require a Department of the Army permit.

9. DATA SOURCES. List sources of data/information used in making determination. Include titles and dates of sources used and ensure that information referenced is available in the administrative record.
  - a. Delineation, maps, data sheets prepared by Cypress Environmental Consulting.
  - b. Desk Review 27 January 2026
  - c. Aerial Photos: Google Earth Aerial Imagery 26 March 2023, 2 October 2020
  - d. United States Department of Interior (DOI), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), National Wetland Inventory (NWI); Accessed 16 December 2025
  - e. United States Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic (Topo) map Aldine Texas 1916 1:24,000; Humble Texas 1916 1:24,000
  - f. USACE Texas Regulatory Viewer 3 DEP Digital Elevation Model (DEM) Accessed 27 January 2026
10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION. N/A
11. NOTE: The structure and format of this MFR were developed in coordination with the EPA and Department of the Army. The MFR's structure and format may be subject to future modification or may be rescinded as needed to implement

CESWG-RDN

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2025-00683

additional guidance from the agencies; however, the approved jurisdictional determination described herein is a final agency action.

**PREPARED BY:**



Jared Bogard  
Regulatory Specialist

Date: 28 January 2026

**REVIEWED/APPROVED BY:**



Andria Davis  
Leader, North Evaluation Unit  
Regulatory Division, Galveston District

Date: 28 January 2026