



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, MEMPHIS DISTRICT  
167 NORTH MAIN STREET ROOM B-202  
MEMPHIS, TN 38103

CEMVM-R

20 March 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),<sup>1</sup> MVM-2023-344<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> 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>4</sup> For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),<sup>5</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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.).

<sup>3</sup> 33 CFR 331.2.

<sup>4</sup> Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-02.

<sup>5</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.

CEMVM-R

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVM-2023-344

amended on 8 September 2023 (Amended 2023 Rule) because, as of the date of this decision, the Amended 2023 Rule is not applicable Tennessee 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).
  - i. Wet Weather Conveyance (WWC) 1, (35.591123, 124), non-jurisdictional
  - ii. WWC 2, (35.590876, -89.232296), non-jurisdictional
  - iii. WWC 3, (35.590693, -89.231847), non-jurisdictional
  - iv. WWC 4, (35.591196, -89.233537), non-jurisdictional
  - v. WWC 5, (35.591226, -89.233690), non-jurisdictional
  - vi. WWC 6, (35.993360, -89.931568), non-jurisdictional
  - vii. WWC 7, (35.593104, -89.9237759), non-jurisdictional
  - viii. WWC 8, (35.593122, -89.237759), non-jurisdictional
  - ix. WWC 9, (35.592934, -89.237667), non-jurisdictional
  - x. WWC 10, (35.590955, -89.231816), non-jurisdictional
  - xi. WWC 11, (35.592734, -89.232767), non-jurisdictional
  - xii. Ditch (D) 1, (35.593210, -89.232657), non-jurisdictional
  - xiii. Pond (P) 1, (35.591334, -89.236384), non-jurisdictional
  - xiv. P 2, (35.590928, -89.230561), non-jurisdictional

## 2. REFERENCES.

- a. Final Rule for Regulatory Programs of the Corps of Engineers, 51 FR 41206 (November 13, 1986).

CEMVM-R

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVM-2023-344

- 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 cover approximately 70 acres near Brownsville, Haywood County, TN. Approximate coordinates of the site are 35.591226° N, - 89.233690° W.
4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. The subject features do not connect to downstream waters. However, the westernmost portion of the project area drains to the Hatchie River and the remainder drains to the South Fork Forked Deer River.
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS. N/A
6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS<sup>6</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>7</sup> 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

---

<sup>6</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>7</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.

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”).<sup>8</sup> 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.

Ponds 1 (.001 acres) and Pond 2 (.001 acres) were farm ponds previously constructed in uplands, but at the time of the determination both had been drained. Both features lacked wetland hydrology and Hydric Soil indicators. Pond 2 also lacked hydrophytic vegetation.

- 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.

---

<sup>8</sup> 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

WWC1 (124), WWC 2 (127 LF), WWC 3 (94 LF), WWC 4 (45 LF), WWC 5 (33 LF), WWC 6 (44 LF), WWC 7 (80 LF), MMC 8 (33 LF), and WWC 9 (LF) are upland erosional gullies that lack indicators of an ordinary high water mark. Furthermore, WWC1, WWC 4, WWC 5, WWC 6 are hydrologically isolated from all other features. WWC 2 flows into WWC 3, but they are hydrologically isolated from all other features. WWC 7 and WWC 8 flow into WWC 9 but are also hydrologically isolated from all other features.

- 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).

WWC 10 (272 LF) is a non-relatively permanent (ephemeral) channel that primarily drains a wooded upland area and is not hydrologically connected to any other features.

WWC 11 (155 LF) is a non-relatively permanent (ephemeral) channel that drains an upland area. WWC 11 flows into D 1. D 1 (457 LF) is a man-made, non-relatively permanent drainage ditch that was constructed in uplands and borders a residential area. The ditch dissipates at each end leaving WWC11 and D1 hydrologically isolated from other features.

CEMVM-R

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVM-2023-344

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. Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the AJD requestor: Terracon Consultants, Inc.
  - b. Photos submitted by or on behalf of the AJD requestor: Terracon Consultants, Inc.
  - c. Google Earth various dates.
  - d. U.S. Geological Survey map: 1:24,000 Sunnyhill
  - e. National Regulatory Viewer 3DEP Hillshade Imagery accessed 02/26/2024.
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.



Project Manager:	CH	Project No.	18227419
Drawn by:	DC	Scale:	Not to Scale
Checked by:	CH	File Name:	EXH 6
Approved by:	CH	Date:	October 2023

**Terracon**

1922 Old Murfreesboro Pike, Nashville, Tennessee 37211  
 PH. (615) 333-6444 FAX (615) 333-6443

**Preliminary Water Resources Map**

SR Brownsville  
 South of US Hwy 70  
 Brownsville, Tennessee

Exhibit
6