



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

CESAC-RD

November 12, 2024

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-2023-00912.

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.² 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.³ For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),⁴ 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 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.

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 33 CFR 331.2.

³ Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-02.

⁴ 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.

- a. The review area is comprised entirely of dry land (i.e., there are no waters such as streams, rivers, wetlands, lakes, ponds, tidal waters, ditches, and the like in the entire review area and there are no areas that have previously been determined to be jurisdictional under the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 in the review area).

The 890.5-acre project area was determined to be void of aquatic resources by review of desktop resources and information submitted by the agent. The USGS topographic survey information located within Lake Robinson quad depicts the project area as uplands that do not contain any blue line features or wetland symbology. In addition, NWIs do not depict any potential wetlands or tributaries onsite. Soil survey information depicts a small portion of the site as partially hydric soils, with the majority being non-hydric soils. The agent's data forms and photographs depict sandy soils comprised of >30% uncoated sand grains within the top 12 inches and indicate the review area lacked indicators of hydrology. Site is dominated by xeric upland longleaf pine ecosystems typical of this area known as the sandhills region of South Carolina. Due to the consistency in the depiction of uplands in desktop resources and information submitted by the agent, the project area addressed in this form was determined to consist entirely of uplands.

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. This form addresses 890.5 acres located at north of and adjacent to Farm loop Road, Mcbee, Chesterfield County, South Carolina (Lat: 34.4633, Long: -80.2412). The 890.5-acre project area was determined to be void of aquatic resources by review of desktop resources and information submitted by the agent. The USGS topographic survey information located within Lake Robinson quad depicts the project area as uplands that do not contain any blue line features or wetland symbology.

CESAC-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SAC-[2023-00912](#)

4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. N/A
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS: N/A
6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS⁵: 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 10.⁶ 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

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.

- 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”).⁷ 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.

There are multiple, shallow surface drainage ditches located within the review area that are constructed in upland, draining only uplands, and do not carry relatively permanent flow.

- 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

⁷ 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-[2023-00912](#)

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). N/A

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. U.S. Geological Survey map(s): 7.5 Minute Index/ Lake Robinson
- b. Quad/ 1:240000; USGS topographic survey information depicts the project boundary as forested uplands void of wetland symbology.
- c. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey: NRCS / Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO), Map service dated March 31, 2021, updated April 26, 2021; Soil Survey information depicts the project boundary as the partially hydric (2% hydric inclusions) Ailey sand.
- d. National wetlands inventory map(s): Wetlands Raster REST Map Service dated December 6, 2021, updated July 17, 2023; NWIs map the project boundary as nearly entirely uplands.
- e. Photographs: SCDNR 2020 Aerial and Site photos submitted by the agent dated July 11, 2023.
- f. Hillshade and USGS 3D Elevation Program(3DEP) Bare Earth DEM
- g. Previous Determination: January 5, 2016, AJD (SAC-2014-01364) issued determining the approximately 645 acres of the review area to be uplands.

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.

State Plane NAD83 (US Feet)

FD	Latitude	Longitude
0	34.46336	-80.241268
1	34.471206	-80.237877
2	34.470504	-80.233421
3	34.474096	-80.232108
4	34.477778	-80.229862
5	34.485957	-80.221831
6	34.481985	-80.21884
7	34.485194	-80.212872
8	34.478592	-80.216037
9	34.476002	-80.207988
10	34.482603	-80.204744
11	34.481389	-80.200874
12	34.475879	-80.203798
13	34.475288	-80.201785
14	34.471	-80.204774
15	34.473755	-80.213443
16	34.470389	-80.214948
17	34.470981	-80.217116
18	34.465822	-80.219647
19	34.469548	-80.229548
20	34.466701	-80.230862
21	34.467943	-80.234772
22	34.466394	-80.235493
23	34.467415	-80.238719
24	34.466261	-80.239216
25	34.465227	-80.236022
26	34.46223	-80.237242

Subject Property: 890.5 Ac+/-

Up ands

0 1,000 2,000 4,000 6,000 Feet

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



TBC
THE BRIGMAN CO.

Approved Jurisdictional Determination Exhibit
Alligator Industrial Park
TMS# 121-000-000-003, 018, and a Portion of 121-000-000-019
MbBee, Chesterfield County, South Carolina
July 11, 2023



1" = 2,000'