



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, FORT WORTH DISTRICT
819 TAYLOR STREET
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102

CESWF-RDE

December 31, 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 [SWF-2024-00435](#), MFR 1 of 1²

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.

CESWF-RDE

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [SWF-2024-00435](#)

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.

- 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 USACE has determined that the review area (*identified as Proposed Flexamat Pavers in light blue and Permanent Rock Filter Dams in green within Enclosure 1*) is upland (i.e., dry land) by using aerial imagery, submitted information from the consultant, and all available information listed in Section 9.

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. [The review area is approximately 2 acres located in Caldwell County, Texas \(29.924300°, -97.676381°\). There are no previous jurisdictional determinations for the review area. There is no other relevant site-specific information associated with the review area.](#)
4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. [Aquatic resources / water features are not within the review area.](#)⁶
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS. [Not Applicable.](#)⁷

CESWF-RDE

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [SWF-2024-00435](#)

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 [Not applicable.](#)
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): [Not applicable.](#)
 - b. Interstate Waters (a)(2): [Not applicable.](#)
 - c. Other Waters (a)(3): [Not applicable.](#)
 - d. Impoundments (a)(4): [Not applicable.](#)
 - e. Tributaries (a)(5): [Not applicable.](#)
 - f. The territorial seas (a)(6): [Not applicable.](#)
 - g. Adjacent wetlands (a)(7): [Not applicable.](#)
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

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.

⁸ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

CESWF-RDE

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [SWF-2024-00435](#)

the review area and describe how it was determined to be non-jurisdictional under the CWA as a preamble water. [Not applicable.](#)

- 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. [Not applicable.](#)
 - 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. [Not applicable.](#)
 - 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. [Not applicable.](#)
 - 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*. [Not applicable.](#)
 - 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). [Not applicable.](#)
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. [USACE site visit was determined unnecessary and a conference call with the consultant followed by a desk-top review of all available information listed herein was used for this determination, multiple dates of review.](#)

CESWF-RDE


SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [SWF-2024-00435](#)

- b. Maps (e.g., Enclosure 1), delineation of aquatic resources, and other information submitted on behalf of the applicant by the consultant, multiple submittal dates.
- c. National Wetlands Inventory, National Hydrography Dataset, 3DEP Hillshade, USGS Topo Map, Soils Maps, National Regulatory Viewer-SWD-Texas, multiple assessment dates.
- d. 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual and Great Plains Supplement were referenced to identify potential jurisdiction.
- e. Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-05 was used to identify the boundaries of non-wetland water features.
- f. Aerial imagery provided by online resources, Google Earth Pro and [Historicaerials.com](#), all available years, multiple assessment dates.

10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION. [None](#)

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.

MATCH LINE SH130 STA 3471+00




LEGEND

- EXISTING RIGHT OF WAY
- ORDINARY HIGH WATER MARK
- PROPOSED FLEXAMAT PAVERS
- PERMANENT ROCK FILTER DAM
- CROSS SECTION LINES

- NOTES:
- THE PROPOSED WORK DOES NOT INTRODUCE ANY ADDITIONAL FILL WITHIN THE OHWM OF PLUM CREEK.
 - THE PROPOSED SCOUR REPAIR AND EROSION CONTROL MEASURES DO NOT HAVE ANY IMPACT TO THE EXISTING IMPERVIOUS COVER.
 - THE EXISTING WETLANDS OF PLUM CREEK ARE NOT BEING IMPACTED DUE TO THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS.


Enclosure 1




PLUM CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL EXHIBIT

FILE NUMBER: _____
NAME: OMEGA ENGINEERS
WATERWAY: PLUM CREEK
PROPOSED ACTIVITY: SCOUR MITIGATION


REPRESENTATIVE CROSS SECTION A-A



REPRESENTATIVE CROSS SECTION A-A (CONTINUED)



Enclosure 1



PLUM CREEK
ENVIRONMENTAL CROSS SECTIONS

FILE NUMBER: _____
NAME: OMEGA ENGINEERS
WATERWAY: PLUM CREEK
PROPOSED ACTIVITY: SCOUR MITIGATION

The diagram is a cross-section of Plum Creek. The vertical axis on the left and right represents elevation in feet, ranging from 420 to 460 in increments of 5. The horizontal axis at the bottom represents distance in feet, ranging from 0 to 230 in increments of 10. A dashed line represents the 'EXISTING GROUND' profile. A solid line represents the 'PROPOSED FLEXAMAT EROSION PROTECTION' fill. The protection is designed with a '2:1 MAX' slope on both sides. A '5.0' MIN' width is specified for the top of the protection. The 'OHWM=436'' (Ordinary High Water Mark) is indicated. Two 'GRADE TO DRAIN' points are shown on the protection. 'EXISTING BRIDGE 24' is shown as a dashed structure crossing the creek. The creek bed is labeled 'PLUM CREEK'.

This cross-section diagram illustrates the proposed erosion protection for Plum Creek. The vertical axis represents elevation in feet, ranging from 420 to 460. The horizontal axis represents distance in feet, ranging from 0 to 200. The diagram shows the existing ground profile (dashed line) and the proposed erosion protection structure (solid line). Key features include:

- EXISTING GROUND:** The dashed line shows the current ground profile, with a high water mark (OHWM) at 436 feet.
- PLUM CREEK:** The creek bed is shown as a dashed line, with a depth of approximately 10 feet at the center.
- EXISTING BRIDGE 25:** The bridge structure is shown as a dashed line, with a height of approximately 455 feet.
- PROPOSED FLEXAMAT EROSION PROTECTION:** The solid line shows the proposed structure, which includes a 2:1 MAX slope and a 5.0' MIN width.
- GRADE TO DRAIN:** The proposed structure is designed to drain the area, with a grade to drain indicated by an arrow.

0 10' 20'

SCALE: 1" = 20' HORZ
1" = 10' VERT

FILE NUMBER: _____
NAME: _____ OMEGA ENGINEERS
WATERWAY: _____ PLUM CREEK
PROPOSED ACTIVITY: _____ SCOUR MITIGATION

8/9/2024

This cross-section profile illustrates the proposed erosion protection for Plum Creek. The vertical axis represents elevation in feet, ranging from 420 to 460. The horizontal axis represents distance in feet, ranging from 0 to 230. The profile shows the existing ground line (dashed) and the proposed erosion protection structure (solid). The structure includes a 2:1 MAX slope, a 5.0' MIN width, and a proposed Flexamat erosion protection fill. The existing ground is labeled 'EXISTING GROUND' and the proposed structure is labeled 'PROPOSED FLEXAMAT EROSION PROTECTION FILL SCOUR HOLES'. The bridge structure is labeled 'EXISTING BRIDGE 25' and the creek is labeled 'PLUM CREEK'. The OHWM (Ordinary High Water Mark) is indicated as 436'.

Distance (ft)	Existing Ground Elevation (ft)	Proposed Structure Elevation (ft)
0	443.5	443.5
10	443.5	443.5
20	443.5	443.5
30	443.5	443.5
40	443.0	443.0
50	442.5	442.5
60	442.0	442.0
70	441.0	441.0
80	438.0	438.0
90	432.0	432.0
100	432.0	432.0
110	435.0	435.0
120	440.0	440.0
130	441.0	441.0
140	441.5	441.5
150	442.0	442.0
160	442.5	442.5
170	443.0	443.0
180	443.5	443.5
190	444.0	444.0
200	444.5	444.5
210	445.0	445.0
220	445.5	445.5
230	446.0	446.0

The diagram is a cross-section of a ditch and proposed erosion protection. The vertical axis represents elevation in feet, ranging from 420 to 460 in increments of 5. The horizontal axis represents distance in feet, ranging from 0 to 200 in increments of 10. A dashed line represents the 'EXISTING GROUND' profile. A solid line represents the 'EXISTING DITCH SCOUR TO PLUM CREEK' profile. A solid line with a double line on the inside represents the 'PROPOSED FLEXAMAT EROSION PROTECTION FILL SCOUR HOLES' profile. The proposed profile has a flat bottom of 14.0' and 3:1 maximum slopes on both sides. Labels with arrows point to the existing ditch, existing ground, proposed erosion protection, and the flat bottom. The proposed erosion protection is shown as a solid line with a double line on the inside, indicating a fill or reinforcement structure.

Distance (ft)	Existing Ground (ft)	Existing Ditch Scour (ft)	Proposed Erosion Protection (ft)
10	443	443	443
20	443	443	443
30	443	443	443
40	442	442	442
50	439	439	439
60	438	438	438
70	441	441	438
80	443	443	438
90	441	441	438
100	433	433	433
110	443	443	443
120	443	443	443
130	443	443	443
140	443	443	443
150	443	443	443
160	442	442	442
170	442	442	442
180	442	442	442

0 10' 20'

SCALE: 1" = 20' HORIZ
1" = 10' VERT

FILE NUMBER: _____
NAME: _____ OMEGA ENGINEERS
WATERWAY: _____ PLUM CREEK
PROPOSED ACTIVITY: _____ SCOUR MITIGATION

8/9/2024

Design File name: c:\pwworking\dir\omega-pp02_omega-prod\1m_roszko\dms28059\SHI30*PLUM-EXHIBIT-05.dgn
 Plotted on: 8/9/2024

460

455

450

445

440

435

430

425

420

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 120 130 140 150 160 170 180 190 200 210 220 230

EXISTING GROUND

EXISTING DITCH SCOUR TO PLUM CREEK

3:1 MAX

3:1 MAX

PROPOSED FLEXAMAT EROSION PROTECTION FILL SCOUR HOLES

PROPOSED FLEXAMAT EROSION PROTECTION FILL SCOUR HOLES

FLAT BOTTOM



FILE NUMBER: _____
NAME: OMEGA ENGINEERS
WATERWAY: PLUM CREEK
PROPOSED ACTIVITY: SCOUR MITIGATION

8/9/2024