



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

CESWG - RDN

25 February 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),¹ SWG-2024-00346²

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 AJD did not rely on the 2023 “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States,’” as

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.

CESWG-RDN

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00346

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

1. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.

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	Feature Type	Size (acres)	Location (latitude) (longitude)		Jurisdictional Status
Pond 1	pond	0.1	30.120260	-95.604489	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Pond 2	pond	0.51	30.119264	-95.604848	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Pond 3	pond	0.09	30.117012	-95.606071	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Pond 4	pond	0.36	30.115039	-95.596865	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Wet 1	wetland	0.9	30.115897	-95.598517	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Wet 2	wetland	0.07	30.115415	-95.598997	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Wet 3	wetland	0.02	30.115057	-95.599128	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Wet 4	wetland	0.12	30.114106	-95.597159	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Wet 5	wetland	6.71	30.112528	-95.597143	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Wet 6	wetland	0.2	30.111973	-95.593888	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional
Wet 7	wetland	0.11	30.110364	-95.595543	non-adjacent, non-jurisdictional

Name	Feature Type	Size (Linear feet)	Location (latitude) (longitude)		Jurisdictional Status
Trib 1	Non-RPW Stream	658	30.115137	-95.597689	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Trib 2	Non-RPW Stream	1,278	30.121321	-95.604523	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Trib 3	Non-RPW Stream	188	30.119862	-95.604718	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Trib 4	Non-RPW Stream	859	30.117894	-95.605281	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Ditch 1	Ditch	2,286	30.116223	-95.604232	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Ditch 2	Ditch	2,557	30.116133	-95.602500	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Ditch 3	Ditch	739	30.116129	-95.599011	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Ditch 4	Ditch	832	30.115507	-95.599190	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Ditch 5	Ditch	282	30.115541	-95.598641	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Ditch 6	Ditch	740	30.115425	-95.597280	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
S 1	Swale	47	30.110109	-95.595114	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional

CESWG-RDN

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00346

Name	Feature Type	Size (Linear feet)	Location		Jurisdictional Status
			(latitude)	(longitude)	
S 2	Swale	252	30.110347	-95.593955	non-RPW, non-jurisdictional
Boggs Gully 1	RPW Stream	353	30.120791	-95.606470	RPW, jurisdictional
Boggs Gully 2	RPW Stream	84	30.116147	-95.608292	RPW, jurisdictional

RPW= Relatively Permanent Water

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 106-acre property located at the intersection at Zion Road and East Hufsmith Road; located at Latitude 30.116310°, Longitude -95.598797°, Houston, Harris County, Texas.
 4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. Spring Creek
 5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS. Boggs Gully flows northeast connecting to Spring Creek, which then flows east approximately 14.5 river miles at which Spring Creek becomes a TNW.

6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS⁶: 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 10.⁷ 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
 - c. Other Waters (a)(3): N/A
 - d. Impoundments (a)(4): N/A
 - e. Tributaries (a)(5): Boggs Gully, is a tributary with permanent flow which connects with Spring Creek, an RPW, flowing east approximately 14.5 river miles at which point Spring Creek becomes a TNW; therefore, Boggs Gully meets the definition of a tributary as defined in the pre-2015 regime post *Sackett* guidance and is a water of the United States.

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.

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”).⁸ 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 1-4 (1.06-acres):

Ponds 1-4 are excavated ponds that are used for livestock watering, or historically were used for watering, and are therefore preamble waters. Furthermore, these preamble waters do not abut a TNW, RPW, and/or a jurisdictional impoundment. 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 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, setline basins, or rice growing. Therefore, Ponds 1-4 are not waters of the United States and are not subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, any discharge of fill material into Ponds 1-5, totaling 0.49 acres, does not require a Department of the Army permit.

- 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.

Ditches, Ditch 1-6 (7,436 Linear Feet):

There are 6 ditches (Ditch1-6) on the tract totaling approximately 7,436 linear feet. The ditches were constructed in uplands and used to drain uplands. The 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, Ditch 1-6 are not a water of the United States subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water

⁸ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

CESWG-RDN

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00346

Act. Any discharge of dredged and/or fill material into Ditch 1-6 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, Wet 1-7 (8.13 acres total), Non-RPW, Trib 1-4 (2,983-linear feet), Swale, S 1-2 (299-linear feet):

Based on data sources listed in #9 below, our 23 February 2026 desk review, we have determined these wetlands 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, Wet 1-7,

CESWG-RDN

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00346

do 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 Wet 1-7 does not require a Department of the Army permit.

The two swales (S 1-2) are erosional features, and Trib 1-4 are tributaries to Boggs Gully that do not carry relatively permanent flow. Therefore, S 1-2 and Trib 1-4 are not a water of the United States subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Any discharge of dredge and/or fill material into these aquatic features, totaling 3,282 linear feet, do 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, and data sheets prepared by Hollaway Environmental and Communications.
 - b. Desk Review: 23 February 2026
 - c. Aerial Photos: Google Earth Aerial Imagery 3 December 2023, 31 January 2004
 - d. United States Department of Interior (DOI), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), National Wetland Inventory (NWI); Accessed 23 February 2026
 - e. United States Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic (Topo) map Tomball Texas 1962 1:24,000
 - f. USACE Texas Regulatory Viewer 3 DEP Digital Elevation Model (DEM) Accessed: 23 February 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 additional guidance from the agencies; however, the approved jurisdictional determination described herein is a final agency action.

CESWG-RDN

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2024-00346

PREPARED BY:



Jared Bogard
Regulatory Specialist

Date: 25 February 2026

REVIEWED/APPROVED BY:



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

Date: 25 February 2026