



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, CHARLESTON DISTRICT
69 HAGOOD AVENUE
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29403

CESAC-RD

14 February 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 SAC-2024-01395, (MFR# 1 of 1)²

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.

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-01395, MFR 1 of 1

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.

- 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).

Name of Aquatic Resource	Acres (AC.)/Linear Feet (L.F)	Waters of the US (WOUS)	Section 404/ Section 10
(Wetland "A") Non-Jurisdictional Wetland	1.81 AC	no	N/A
(Wetland "B") Non-Jurisdictional Wetland	1.02 AC.	no	N/A
(Wetland "C") Non-Jurisdictional Wetland	0.06 AC	no	N/A
(Wetland "D") Non-Jurisdictional Wetland	0.02 AC	no	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Ditch 1	756 L.F.	no	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Ditch 2	498 L.F.	no	N/A

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. ___, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023)

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-01395, MFR 1 of 1

3. REVIEW AREA.

- a. Project Area Size: 20.96 acres
- b. Center Coordinates of the review area: Latitude: 33.6763°, Longitude - 78.9450°
- c. Nearest City: Myrtle Beach
- d. County: Horry
- e. State: South Carolina

The review area is a 20.96-acre site with 2.91-acres of delineated wetlands and 1,254 L.F of upland excavated ditches. The review area is surrounded by development to include an International airport, residential and commercial developments and public roadways. Onsite is a fill pad that has been existence since 1963 located on the southwest portion of the property. There has been two (2) previous Jurisdictional Determinations (JD), an approved (AJD) and a preliminary (PJD), that encompassed the review which are documented under SAC-80-2002-1868 (PJD), dated February 13, 2003, and SAC-2008-00070-3JH (AJD) dated September 30, 2008. The AJD documented under SAC-2008-00070-3JH documented the entire 20-acre review area as all uplands citing the area lacked all three parameters that define a wetland: specifically, the hydrology parameter. The PJD documented under SAC-80-2002-1868 determined the area to consist of approximately 4.11 acres of wetlands.

- 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. Wetlands onsite were determined not to be adjacent to any waters of the US.
- 6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS⁷: Describe aquatic resources or other features within the review area determined to be jurisdictional in accordance with

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.

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-01395, MFR 1 of 1

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
- 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

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.

⁹ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

the review area and describe how it was determined to be non-jurisdictional under the CWA as a preamble water.

- 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.

The review area contains two upland excavated ditches totaling 1,254 L.F. These features are identified as ditches on the associated wetland sketch. These features were determined to have been *excavated wholly in and draining only dry lands and do not carry a relative permanent flow of water*.

Previous JDs, documented above, determined the areas where the ditches are located to be uplands.

- 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).

Non-Jurisdictional Wetlands (Wetlands A-D) The project area contains four isolated non-jurisdictional wetlands totaling 2.91. These wetlands were assessed

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-01395, MFR 1 of 1

and determined to be isolated non-jurisdictional with no continuous surface connection to any jurisdictional waters. These depressional wetlands exhibited hydric soils, hydrophytic vegetation, and indicators of hydrology, which satisfied the criteria set forth in the 1987 Corps' Wetland Delineation Manual and the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Regional Supplement. All water located within or draining toward these wetlands have no discernible or traceable outfall or connection to any Waters of the US (WOUS). Additionally, the wetlands were found to be surrounded by forested uplands which further disrupts possible connections to any WOUS. The topographic map depicts these wetlands as forested uplands. Aerial photographs depict these wetlands as forested, and review of LiDAR data revealed that no linear drainage features within the delineated boundary of the wetlands. The NWI depicts the wetlands B, C, and D as uplands.

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. Review Performed for Site Evaluation: Office (Desk) Determination.
Date: January 31, 2025.
 - b. Aquatic Resources delineation submitted by, or on behalf of, the requestor: Wetland delineation submittal for the DCB MYR North Tract provided by Terracon in the submittal dated October 29, 2024.
 - c. Aerial Imagery: 2020 SCDNR IR Aerial & 2020 SCDNR Aerial SC_2020_NIR (Map Service)
 - d. LIDAR: 3DEP Digital Elevation Model (DEM)
<https://elevation.nationalmap.gov/arcgis/rest/services/3DEPElevation/ImageServer>
 - e. USDA NRCS Soil Survey: Wahee fine sandy loam and Yemassee loamy fine sand. SSURGO database.
 - f. USGS topographic maps: 7.5 Minute – 1988 Myrtle Beach Quad: Quad depicts the review as upland forested and upland cleared areas. USA Topo Map
 - g. National Wetland Inventory (NWI): NWI depicts the delineated boundaries of the Wetland A as forested wetlands. Wetland B-D are depicted as uplands on the NWI map.
<https://fwspublicservices.wim.usgs.gov/wetlandsmapservice/rest/services/Wetlands/MapServer/0>

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-01395, MFR 1 of 1

- h. National Hydrography Dataset (NHD): NHD identifies offsite drainage canals in proximity of the review area. None of the onsite upland excavated ditches are depicted on the NHD map.

<https://hydro.nationalmap.gov/arcgis/rest/services/nhd/MapServer>

10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION. Previous JDs documented under SAC-80-2002-1868 (PJD), dated February 13, 2003, and SAC-2008-00070-3JH (AJD) dated September 30, 2008.

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.

The Wetland Lines depicted on this drawing were flagged and located with a Trimble Geo7x GPS with GNSS receiver in the field by Terracon Consultants on 08/29/24. Each flagging point was at sub-meter accuracy.

Total Non-jurisdictional Wetlands: ~2.91 Acres
Total Non-jurisdictional Ditches: ~0.17 Acres/~1,254 Linear Feet
Total Uplands: ~18.05 Acres
Total Site Acreage: ~20.96 Acres

SITE

Legend

- Approximate Site Boundary
- Non-jurisdictional Wetland
- Non-jurisdictional Ditch
- Wetland Data Point
- ▲ Upland Data Point



0 100 200 400
Feet

Project No.
ER247031
PM:
DM
Drawn By:
JTM
Date:
10/28/2024



1800 Reynolds Avenue N.Charleston, SC 29405
Phone: 843.884.1234 Fax: 843.884.9234

Depiction of Aquatic Resources Map

Wetland Delineation
DCB MYR North
Myrtle Beach, Horry County, South Carolina

EXHIBIT NO.

A

Esri, HERE, Garmin, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, Source: Esri, Maxar, Earthstar Geographics, and the GIS User Community

Non-jurisdictional Wetland A
~1.81 Acres

DP2
DP1

Non-jurisdictional Ditch
~0.12 Acres/756 LF

Non-jurisdictional Wetland B
~1.02 Acres

DP3

Non-jurisdictional Wetland D
~0.02 Acres

Non-jurisdictional Wetland C
~0.06 Acres

Non-jurisdictional Ditch
~0.05 Acres/498 LF