



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

CESAC-RD

12 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-2024-00847, (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-2024-00847, 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
Non-Jurisdictional Wetland 1	0.08 AC	No	N/A
Jurisdictional Wetland 1	4.57 AC	Yes	Section 404
Non-Jurisdictional Feature Pond	0.21 AC	No	N/A
Non-Jurisdictional Ditches	1250 LF	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)

3. REVIEW AREA.

- a. Project Area Size: 48.99 acres
- b. Center Coordinates of the review area: Latitude: 33.8404°, Longitude: -78.8753°
- c. Nearest City: Nixonville
- d. County: Horry

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-00847, MFR 1 of 1

e. State: South Carolina

The review area is a 48.99-acre site with 4.57 acres of delineated jurisdictional wetlands. Portions of the site are open agricultural land. Other portions of the review area are forested, developed with a residential house and other buildings, and an upland excavated ornamental pond. Also onsite are two (2) upland excavated ditches determined to drain only uplands and one isolated non-jurisdictional wetland totaling 0.08 acre. The review area is surrounded partially by development and open agricultural land.

4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. The nearest TNW which the onsite freshwater wetlands flows to is the Waccamaw River.

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

Jurisdictional Wetland 1 is contiguous to an offsite un-named tributary which flows west to its confluence to Tilly swamp (tributary) which flows south to its confluence with Tilly Lake which outfalls directly into the Waccamaw River, 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

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.

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): **Jurisdictional Wetland 1** is contiguous to an offsite un-named tributary ((a)(5)) which flows west to its confluence to Tilly swamp ((a)(5) tributary) which flows south to its confluence with Tilly Lake which outfalls directly into the Waccamaw River, ((a)(1) TNW).

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.

The review area contains one (1) upland excavated ornamental pond depicted as Non-Jurisdictional Feature Pond on the associated wetland map. This pond was determined to be a Preamble waters (51 FR 41217) Reference page 16 of 59: https://archives.federalregister.gov/issue_slice/1986/11/13/41202-41260.pdf

Preamble waters (51 FR 41217), in part, are: Artificial reflecting or swimming pools or other small ornamental bodies of water created by excavating and/or diking dry land to retain water for primarily aesthetic reasons are Preamble waters (51 FR 41217).

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-2024-00847, MFR 1 of 1



9 View of non-jurisdictional pond on site at Photo Point 5.

- 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 (2) upland excavated ditches totaling approximately +/- 1,250 linear feet. These features are identified as Non-Jurisdictional 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.

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-00847, MFR 1 of 1



5 Typical view of non-jurisdictional ditch on site at Photo Point

- 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 Wetland 1 The project area contains one isolated non-jurisdictional wetland totaling 0.08 acre. This wetland was assessed and determined to be isolated non-jurisdictional with no continuous surface connection to any jurisdictional waters. The depressional wetland 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 this wetland has no discernible or traceable outfall or connection to any Waters of the US (WOUS). Additionally, the topographic map depicts this wetland as forested uplands. Aerials photographs depict this wetland as forested, and review of LiDAR data revealed that no linear drainage features within the delineated boundary of the delineated wetland. The NWI depicts the wetland 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: March 10, 2025.
 - b. Aquatic Resources delineation submitted by, or on behalf of, the requestor: Wetland delineation submittal for the Mary Marlowe Tract provided by the Brigman Company in the submittal dated July 10, 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: depicts Lakeland and Blanton Both Non-hydric soils and Johnston Loan hydric soils. SSURGO database.
 - f. USGS topographic maps: 7.5 Minute – Nixonville Quad: Quad depicts the review as upland forested. USA Topo Map
 - g. National Wetland Inventory (NWI): NWI depicts the delineated wetland (jurisdictional Wetland 1) as PSS1/3Bd (partially drained wetland) and the remainder of the site to include upland excavated pond, ditches and the isolated non-jurisdictional wetland as uplands.

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-2024-00847, MFR 1 of 1

<https://fwspublicservices.wim.usgs.gov/wetlandsmapservice/rest/services/Wetlands/MapServer/0>

- h. National Hydrography Dataset (NHD): NHD identifies no onsite drainage canals within the review area.

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

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.



Wetland Delineation/Determination

Mary Marlowe Tract

Horry County, South Carolina
Tax Map Number 344-00-00-0014

Area Summary:	
Jurisdictional Wetland	4.57
Non-Jurisdictional Wetland	0.08
Uplands	0.21
Total	44.13
	48.99

Notes
1. Potential wetland/non-wetland areas depicted here on have not been verified by the US Army Corps of Engineers. Areas depicted as wetlands were identified using a combination of available remote sensing and onsite investigation. Prior to any land disturbing activities, or land transactions a final jurisdictional determination should be obtained from the US Army Corps of Engineers.

2. Boundary information taken from Horry County GIS/Tax Parcel information.
3. Onsite inspection was conducted on 7/1/24.

Legend

- Line Legend**
- Boundary
 - Adjacent Boundary
 - Right of Way
 - Jurisdictional Tributary
 - Non-Jurisdictional Ditch
 - Dirt Road
 - Bulkhead

- Hatch Legend**
- Jurisdictional Wetland
 - Non-Jurisdictional Wetland
 - Critical Area/Section 10

- Symbol Legend**
- Data Point
 - Photo Point
 - Property Corner

Prepared For: Rowe Professional Services
Job #: 01110-24193
Date: 7/3/24

Graphic Scale

