

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

CESWG-RD-C 6 October 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), <sup>1</sup> SWG-2025-00461

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>2</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>3</sup> For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),<sup>4</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 iurisdiction.

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

# 1. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.

<sup>&</sup>lt;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>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 33 CFR 331.2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-02.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</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.

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2025-00461

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). [

Summary of Wetlands and Waterbodies Identified within the Survey Area					
Resource Name	Classification	Size (Linear Feet)	Coordinates	Jurisdiction	
Unnamed Tributary of Sims Bayou (C124-00-00)	Perennial Stream	0.44 AC / 1,897 LF	29.644589, -95.346095	Relatively permanent, Jurisdictional	
\$1001	Ephemeral Stream	0.02 AC / 262 LF	29.644275, -95.343417	Non-relatively permanent, Non-jurisdictional	
Wetland 1	PFO Wetland	4.54 AC	29.644090, -95.345098	Non-Adjacent, Non- jurisdictional	
Wetland 2	PFO Wetland	1.93 AC	29.644172, -95.342274	Non-Adjacent, 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

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2025-00461

- 3. REVIEW AREA. The 36-acre tract is located south of Airport Boulevard, east of Murr Way and west of Marin Luther King Boulevard in Houston, Harris County, Texas. The center coordinates for the site are 29.644560°, -95.345409°.
- 4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. Sims Bayou
- 5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS
  - HCFCD C124-00-00 flows into Simy Bayou, a relatively permanent water that becomes a traditional navigable water approximately 4.8 river miles downstream.
- 6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS<sup>5</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>6</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.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</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>&</sup>lt;sup>6</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.

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2025-00461

- 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): HCFCD C124-00-00 is a relatively permanent tributary to Sims Bayou
- 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"). 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. N/A
- 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. N/A
- 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2025-00461

- 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).

S1001 is a non-relatively permanent drainage feature that only flows in response to precipitation events. It is not present on any topographic map. The photos of the feature provided in the delineation report do not show any typical indicators of relatively permanent flow. Therefore, S1001 is 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 S1001, totaling 262 linear feet, does not require a Department of the Army permit.

Wetland 1 and Wetland 2 do not meet the continuous surface connection standard for adjacent wetlands as they do not abut a relatively permanent water, a jurisdictional impoundment, or a traditional navigable water. Therefore, these wetlands are not waters of the United States subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Any discharge of dredge and/or fill material into these wetlands, totaling 6.47 acres, 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. Aerial Photographs: 31 December 1943 through 15 March 2025
  - b. United States Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic Maps: 1915 Park Place 1:24000, 1922 Park Place 1:31680, 1955 Park Place 1:24000, 1967 Park Place 1:24000, 2010 Park Place 1:24000, 2016 Park Place 1:24000, 2022 Park Place 1:24000
  - c. United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map *Accessed* 2 October 2025
  - d. US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Map *Accessed* 2 October 2025

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWG-2025-00461

- e. USGS National Map 3D Elevation Program (3DEP) LiDAR 2 January 2025 Accessed 1 October 2025
- f. Delineation Report submitted by Harris County Flood Control District on 27 August 2025

# 10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION. N/A

Corpus Christi Field Office, Galveston District

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:		
Anna Suglaar	Date: 6 Octobe	er 2025
Anna Fuglaar		
Regulatory Specialist		
REVIEWED/APPROVED BY:		
Digitally signed by		
VICK.KARA.DIAN.1368 Date: 2025.10.06 14:17	285117 :56 -05'00' <b>-&gt;</b>	
	Date:	
Kara Vick		
Team Lead		

