

# DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, SAVANNAH DISTRICT 4751 BEST ROAD, SUITE 140 COLLEGE PARK, GEORGIA 30337

CESAS-RD-P

7 April 2025

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S.Ct. 1322 (2023), SAS-2024-00729

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. 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.<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),<sup>3</sup> 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 Georgia due to litigation.

<sup>2</sup> Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-02.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 33 CFR 331.2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 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.

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S.Ct. 1322 (2023), SAS-2024-00729

#### 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	ce JD or non-JD	Section 404/Section 10
Wetland	Non-JD	Section 404

#### 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.651, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023).
- e. Memorandum to the field between the U.S. Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency concerning the proper implementation of "continuous surface connection" under the definition of "waters of the United States" under the Clean Water Act (March 12, 2025).

#### 3. REVIEW AREA

- A. 7.94 acres
- B. Latitude: 33.5613, Longitude: -82.0995
- C. Evans
- D. Columbia County
- E. Georgia
- 4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED.

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S.Ct. 1322 (2023), SAS-2024-00729

- A. The Savannah River, located approximately 10,000 linear feet (3 linear kilometers) northeast of the subject review area, is the nearest TNW. The aquatic resource is not connected to a downstream TNW.
- B. Determination based on: This determination was made based on a review of desktop data resources listed in Section 9 of this memorandum, a field visit conducted on March 7, 2024, and a review of the SAS Section 10 list (for a water body that is navigable-in-fact under federal law for any purpose (such as Section 10, RHA), that water body categorically qualifies as a Section 404 "traditional navigable water" subject to CWA jurisdiction under 33 CFR 328.3(a)(1)), and documented occurrences of boating traffic on the identified water.
- 5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS

The delineated wetland on the project site drains west through an outlet control structure out of the review area. Flow from the wetland then enters a culvert that goes under Oleander Road. The length of this culvert is approximately 300 feet. Upon exiting the culvert, flow continues southwest for approximately 500 feet through a combination of stormwater pipes, overland sheet flow, and through a stormwater pond to a culvert underneath Furys Ferry Road for 150 feet and then into an unnamed tributary of Jones Creek (a RPW). The unnamed tributary then flows northwest for approximately 800 feet into Jones Creek (a RPW). Jones Creek flows northeast for an additional approximately 8,700 feet into the Savannah River (nearest TNW).

6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS<sup>4</sup>: 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.<sup>5</sup> N/A

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 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.

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S.Ct. 1322 (2023), SAS-2024-00729

- 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"). 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

4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S.Ct. 1322 (2023), SAS-2024-00729

be non-jurisdictional under the CWA based on the criteria listed in the guidance. N/A

- 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).

Name of Aquatic Resource	Size (in acres)	Type of resource generally not jurisdictional
Wetland	0.61	This non-tidal wetland lacks a continuous surface connection to a downstream jurisdictional water.

Wetland: The delineated wetland on the project site drains west through an outlet control structure out of the review area. Flow from the wetland is intermittent and then enters a culvert that goes under Oleander Road. The length of this culvert is approximately 300 feet. Upon exiting the culvert, flow continues southwest for approximately 500 feet through a combination of stormwater pipes and overland sheet flow. This is the point of continuous surface connection severance for the jurisdictional determination. The wetland is far removed from and not abutting a jurisdictional water. The wetland meets the hydrophytic vegetation, wetland hydrology, and hydric soil criteria of the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S.Ct. 1322 (2023), SAS-2024-00729

Delineation Manual and the Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Regional Supplement but is not considered adjacent to a downstream jurisdictional water.

- 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. Office (desktop) determination: March 2025
  - b. Field Review: March 7, 2025 by CESAS-RDP
  - c. Data sources used to support this determination (included in the administrative record).
    - Aquatic Resources delineation submitted by, or on behalf of, the requestor: "Aquatic Resource Delineation Sketch", prepared by the Agent and dated August 20, 2024.
    - Wetland Determination Data Sheets: prepared by the Agent and dated August 12, 2024.
    - ☑ Photographs: "1094.0 BAPS Augusta Phase I ARDR Photo Documentation"
      (Photos 1-15), prepared by the Agent, and dated August 12, 2024; Site visit supplemental photographs (Photos 16-21), taken by PM and dated March 7, 2025.
    - Aerial Imagery: "Columbia County, GA", prepared by Agent and dated May 28, 2024.
    - ► LIDAR: LiDAR (3DEP DEM and Hillshade), retrieved from the Georgia Regulatory Viewer (NRV) by PM in March 2025.

    - ☑ USFWS NWI map: "National Wetlands Inventory Map", prepared by the agent and dated August 20, 2024.
    - ☑ USGS topographic maps: "USGS Topographic Vicinity Map", prepared by the Agent and dated August 20, 2024.
    - ☑ USGS Hydric soils maps and data: Retrieved by the Agent and dated May 28, 2024.
    - StreamStats: Maps and data retrieved by PM in March 2025.
    - ▼ FEMA Flood Zone: "FEMA Flood Hazard Zone Map", prepared by the Agent and dated August 20, 2024.

#### 10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION. N/A

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651, 143 S.Ct. 1322 (2023), SAS-2024-00729

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.





### BAPS Augusta Phase I Columbia County, GA

## **Aquatic Resources Delineation Sketch**

Prepared For: BAPS Augusta

BW Project No.: 1094.0

Exhibit No.: 6

Delineation By: MA/MD

Delineation By: MA/MD

Drawn By: NH
Reviewed By: MD

Sketch Date: 08/20/2024