



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

CESAC-RDS

13 March 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-2024-00378, (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-2024-00378

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 (JD or Non-JD)	Section 404/Section 10
Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 1	0.29 AC	Non-JD	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 2	0.07 AC	Non-JD	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 3	0.56 AC	Non-JD	N/A
Jurisdictional Wetland 4	1.66 AC	JD	Section 404
Non-Jurisdictional Feature 5 (Stormwater Pond)	0.7 AC	Non-JD	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Feature 7 (ditch)	316.8 LF	Non-JD	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Feature 8 (ditch)	306 LF	Non-JD	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Feature 9 (ditch)	75.4 LF	Non-JD	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-2024-00378

- e. 1980s preamble language (including regarding waters and features that are generally non-jurisdictional) (51 FR 41217 (November 13, 1986) and 53 FR 20765 (June 6, 1988))

3. REVIEW AREA.

- A. Project size: 60.3 acres
- B. Center Coordinates of the review area:
Latitude: 33.0772 Longitude: -79.9945
- C. Nearest City: Moncks Corner
- D. County: Berkeley
- E. State: South Carolina
Other associated jurisdictional determinations (including outcomes): SAC-2022-01053 was a Delineation Concurrence letter that was issued on September 1, 2022. The project site was a 60-acre site that was located at TMS# 211-00-02-0217 and TMS# 211-00-02-215, located at 124 Spring Grove Drive in Moncks Corner, Berkeley County, South Carolina (Latitude: 33.0777°, Longitude: -79.9925°. The 2022 DC concurred that there are 3.51-acres of freshwater wetlands and 0.7-acre Non-Wetland Waters (Pond) within the project area.

The review area is located within portions of two parcels (TMS# 211-00-02-0217 and TMS# 211-00-02-215). These parcels contain an industrial park, one (1) stormwater pond, as well as undeveloped forested land.

4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED.

- A. Black River, which is a TNW. Navigable limits of the Black River are documented in the Corps' Navigability Study of 1977, Black River Area Report No. 06.
- B. Determination based on: A review of desktop data resources listed in Section 9 of this memorandum.

5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS

Jurisdictional Wetland 4: Jurisdictional Wetland 4 is 1.66-acres in size and flows offsite into ditches for approximately 960 feet on an adjacent tract to the south, where it flows into Sophia Swamp, the nearest requisite water.

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): N/A.
 - f. The territorial seas (a)(6): N/A.
 - g. Adjacent wetlands (a)(7): The aquatic resource identified as Jurisdictional Wetland 4 is 1.66-acres in size and flows offsite into ditches for approximately

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.

960 feet on an adjacent tract to the south, where it flows into Sophia Swamp (perennial tributary / A5 water), the nearest requisite water.

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.
- 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.

Non-Jurisdictional Features 7 through 9 (Ditches): The review area contains 57.02 acres of uplands and has three linear features that total approximately 698.32 linear feet. These three Non-Jurisdictional Features (Ditches) have been determined to be non-navigable, drains wholly uplands, was excavated out of uplands, consists of low and infrequent flow, and lacks evidence of an OHWM.

- 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.
- 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*.

⁸ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-00378

Aquatic Resource Name	Resource Type	Reason the AR is not jurisdictional
Non-jurisdictional Pond	Non-wetland Water	The onsite Non-jurisdictional Pond was excavated in uplands, and historic aerial imagery indicates it was constructed between xx and xx. The pond is excavated entirely in uplands, drains only uplands, and does not have a relatively permanent flow.

- 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 Wetland 1: Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 1 is 0.29-acres in size and does not abut or have a discernable CSC/connection to a TNW or tributary with relatively permanent flow. Wetland 1 is an isolated forested wetland system located within a depressional land feature that does not contain a continuous surface connection or flowpath which provides evidence of surface flow to a jurisdictional water of the U.S.

Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 2: Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 2 is 0.07-acres in size and does not abut or have a discernable CSC/connection to a TNW or tributary with relatively permanent flow. Wetland 2 is an isolated forested wetland system located within a depressional land feature that does not contain a continuous surface connection or flowpath which provides evidence of surface flow to a jurisdictional water of the U.S.

Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 3: Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 3 is 0.56-acres in size and does not abut or have a discernable CSC/connection to a TNW or tributary with relatively permanent flow. Wetland 3 is an isolated forested wetland system located within a depressional land feature that does not contain a continuous surface connection or flowpath which provides evidence of surface flow to a jurisdictional water of the U.S.

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 (desktop) Determination.
Date: July 29, 2024

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-00378


- b. Map submitted by or on behalf of, the applicant/consultant: “Approximately 60.3 Acre Spring Grove East Tract, TMS# 211-00-02-217, 211-00-02-215, Moncks Corner, Berkeley County, SC”, map dated October 21, 2024.
- c. Wetland Delineation Data Sheets: Prepared and submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant. This office concurs with the data sheets/delineation report.
- d. Site Photographs: Photos provided by Red Bay Environmental, submitted as part of the JD request dated March 21, 2024.
- e. USGS Topographic map: 7.5 Minute – Kittredge: Quad depicts the review area void as mainly forested uplands with some development. No symbols that typically represent potential waters of the US are depicted on the USGS topographic maps.
- f. USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Map Service: NWI depicts the review area as upland with several freshwater forested/shrub wetland. <https://arcportal-ucop-corps.usace.army.mil/s0portal/home/item.html?id=1eb5aab71973402fbdb879cbb7bd3595>
- g. National Hydrographic Dataset (NHD): NHD does not depict any linear features within the review area.
<https://hydro.nationalmap.gov/arcgis/rest/services/nhd/MapServer>
- h. USDA NRCS Soil Survey: Soil survey depicts the following soil types: Duplin fine sandy loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), Meggett loam, Wahee loam, and Craven loam (2 to 6 percent slopes), This layer displays soil map units derived from the SSURGO database. <https://arcportal-ucop-corps.usace.army.mil/s0portal/home/item.html?id=045a6ccb74954698892c0cc5106beee5>
- i. USGS 3D Elevation Program (3DEP) Map Service: <https://arcportal-ucop-corps.usace.army.mil/s0portal/home/item.html?id=8ba4619c2e60467a909a1bc31e3a06cc>
- j. Aerial Imagery: 2020 SCDNR IR Aerial_2020_NIR (Map Service)
https://tiles.arcgis.com/tiles/RvqSyw3diI7dTKo5/arcgis/rest/services/SC_2020_NIR/MapServer

10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION.

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-00378

- a. Previous Delineation Concurrence (DC) Letter, SAC-2022-01053, dated September 1, 2022.
 - b. EPA / HQ joint memo **NWP-2023-00602**
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.



Project Boundary ———

12/19/2024

**Total Upland Acreage
~ 57.02 Acres**

**Non-jurisdictional Feature 9
(~75.4 LF)**

N 33.080764
W 79.992167

**Non-jurisdictional Wetland 1
~ 0.29 Acres**

**Non-jurisdictional Wetland 3
~ 0.56 Acres**

N 33.077714
W 79.996454

**Non-jurisdictional Wetland 2
~ 0.07 Acres**

N 33.076914
W 79.994774

**Jurisdictional Wetland 4
~ 1.66 Acres**

N 33.078605
W 79.98898

N 33.077988
W 79.989591

N 33.077654
W 79.989157

**Non-jurisdictional Feature 8
(~306 LF)**

**Non-jurisdictional Feature 7
(~316.8 LF)**

N 33.074953
W 79.993854

**Non-jurisdictional Feature 5
~ 0.7 Acres**

N 33.075318
W 79.995245

N 33.07595
W 79.993516

~~**Jurisdictional Feature 6
(~550.8 LF)**~~

Note: this ditch is located within the wetland
Revised by the Corps on 2/26/2025

N 33.075571
W 79.991298

**Approximately 60.3 Acre Spring Grove East Tract
Supplemental Features Exhibit
TMS# 211-00-02-217, 211-00-02-215
Moncks Corner, Berkeley County, SC**

1/30/2025