



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, GALVESTON DISTRICT
5151 FLYNN PARKWAY, SUITE 306
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS 78411

CESWG - RDR

1 December 2025

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),¹ SWG-2024-00109²

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.³ 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.⁴ For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),⁵ 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

¹ 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.

² 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.).

³ 33 CFR 331.2.

⁴ Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-02.

⁵ 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.

South Branch

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00109

AJD did not rely on the 2023 “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States,’” as 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).
 - i. S1 (0.04 acres), Upland Ditch, 26.288320 N; 98.360736 W, non-jurisdictional
 - ii. P1 (1.35 acres), Pond, 26.280334 N; 98.367801 W, non-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. The review area begins from the drainage ditch south on N. Bensten Palm Drive to Harvest Time Road and west adjacent to Lanford Road, J and A Drive, N. Minnesota Road, Quale Street, and W. Mile 4 Road.

Latitude: 26.291574 N; Longitude: 98.37284 W

South Branch

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00109

4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. N/A⁶
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS. N/A
6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS⁷: 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 10.⁸ 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
 - b. Interstate Waters (a)(2): N/A

⁶ This MFR should not be used to complete a new stand-alone TNW determination. A stand-alone TNW determination for a water that is not subject to Section 9 or 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA) is completed independently of a request for an AJD. A stand-alone TNW determination is conducted for a specific segment of river or stream or other type of waterbody, such as a lake, where upstream or downstream limits or lake borders are established.

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

South Branch

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00109

- c. Other Waters (a)(3): N/A
- d. Impoundments (a)(4): N/A
- e. Tributaries (a)(5): N/A
- 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”).⁹ 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.

P1 (1.35 acres): LiDAR, topo, and aerial photographs, utilized as part of desktop analysis to identify that this water feature is an excavated pond. The 1.35-acre pond was excavated from uplands. There is no continuous surface connection from the pond to any relatively permanent water. This feature is best described in the preamble for 33 CFR 328.3, published in the Federal Register Volume 51, Number 219, 13 NOV 1986 (page 41217), which states, “For clarification, it should be noted that we generally do not consider the following waters to be Waters of the United States (c) Artificial lakes or ponds created by excavating and/or diking dry land to collect and retain water and which are used exclusively for such purposes as stock watering, irrigation, settling basins, or rice growing.” This pond was created in uplands for the purpose of stock watering and is not a water of the United States.

- b. Describe aquatic resources and features within the review area identified as “generally not jurisdictional” in the *Rapanos* guidance. 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 based on the criteria listed in the guidance.

S1 (0.04 acres): LiDAR, topo, and aerial photographs, utilized as part of desktop analysis to identify that this water feature is a non-tidal drainage ditch that has been excavated wholly in dry land that do not transport relatively permanent flow directly to a TNW or RPW. This is best described in the preamble for 33 CFR

⁹ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

South Branch

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00109

328.3, published in the Federal Register Volume 51, Number 219, published November 13, 1986 (page 41217), which states “For clarification, it should be noted that we generally do not consider the following Waters of the United States... (a) Non-tidal drainage or irrigation ditches excavated on dry land.” Thus, this drainage feature is considered non-jurisdictional; therefore, the Corps does not have jurisdiction of any of its features.

- 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). N/A

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. Google Earth Aerials dated: 1995, 2002, 2005, 2010, 2015, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025
- b. USGS Topographic Map/Scale: Alton, TX; 1:24,000 and Citrus City, TX; 1:24,000

South Branch

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00109

- c. NRCS Soil Survey titled: Hidalgo County, Texas; NRCS Website accessed on 13 November 2025
- d. ORM2 Database – No jurisdictional determinations have been conducted for the review area
- e. Regulatory Viewer accessed 13 November 2025: LiDAR and FWS Wetland Map
- f. 3D Hydrography Program accessed 28 October 2025

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

PREPARED BY:

BOGRAND.ASHLEY.  Digitally signed by
BOGRAND.ASHLEY.LOUISE.16170
LOUISE.1617035495 35495
Date: 2025.12.01 15:26:53 -06'00'

Date: _____


Ashley Bogrand
Regulatory Project Manager
South Branch

REVIEWED/APPROVED BY:

VICK.KARA.DIA  Digitally signed by
VICK.KARA.DIAN.1368285117
Date: 2025.12.01 15:19:47
-06'00'

Date: _____

Kara Vick
Team Lead
South Branch, Galveston District




HIDALGO COUNTY
DRAINAGE DISTRICT No. 1



Raul E. Sesin P.E., C.F.M.
General Manager
Floodplain Administrator

Bentsen Palm Drive Stormwater Improvement Location Map



SWG-2024-00109

Sheet 2 of 6

Legend

Hidalgo County

SWG-2024-00109

Review Area

S1

P1

Review Area - 23 acres
Lat: 26.291574
Long: -98.37284

2894

65th St

364

LaMota Rd

LaMota Rd

La Mancha Dr

La Mancha Dr

Gooch Rd

Andesito Dr


W Mier Rd

N Minnesota Rd

N Bentzen Palm Dr

Sheet 4 of 6

2000 ft



Google Earth



Legend

Review Area

P1-1.35 ac



SWG-2024-00109

Sheet 5 of 6

Legend

Review Area

S1

P1

Hidalgo County

LA MUELLE RD

Gooch Rd

Andresito Dr

W Mile 4 Rd

N Minnesota Rd

180

La Mancha Dr

Lanford Rd

ELEVATED

Gas Well

2894

Maricot Dr

W 66th St

65th St

N-Schuerbach Rd

De La Gata

St

364

163

180

Moorefield Rd

Garland St

Richmond St

N La Homa Rd

N Palm Leaf Cir

S. Palm Leaf Cir

185

185

185

185

185

185

185

185

N

3000 ft

Google Earth ELEVATED

