



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, VICKSBURG DISTRICT
4155 EAST CLAY STREET
VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39183

CEMVK-RD

October 20, 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 MVK-2025-492

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 Mississippi due to litigation.

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.

CEMVK-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVK-2025-492

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)

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 Project study area encompasses approximately 4,619.20 acres, consisting primarily of agricultural plots and small pockets of undeveloped forested land located approximately 3 miles north of Tchula, in Holmes County, Mississippi

4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. The Nearest downstream Section 10 TNW is the Yazoo River (Section 10 TNW)
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS: The subject site drains in a southward direction offsite via unnamed tributaries of Horseshoe Lake or Tchula Lake. Horseshoe Lake drains into Tchula Lake just offsite to the south. (Both Tchula Lake and Horseshoe Lake are being addressed via PJD) Once offsite Tchula Lake flows for 58.2 KM before reaching the Yazoo River (Section 10 TNW)

CEMVK-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVK-2025-492

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.

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):
 - b. Interstate Waters (a)(2):
 - c. Other Waters (a)(3):
 - d. Impoundments (a)(4):
 - e. Tributaries (a)(5):
 - f. The territorial seas (a)(6):
 - g. Adjacent wetlands (a)(7):

8. NON-JURISDICTIONAL AQUATIC RESOURCES AND FEATURES

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.

CEMVK-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVK-2025-492

- 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”).⁶ 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 or enter rationale/discussion here.]
- 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).

⁶ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

CEMVK-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVK-2025-492

Based on the consultant’s report the NRPW features below do not satisfy the relatively permanent standard and are not jurisdictional.

Waters_Name	State	Cowardin_Code	Meas_Type	Amount	Units	Waters_Type	Latitude	Longitude
SB-48-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	289.096573	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.26090000	-90.28090000
SB-47-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	165.368508	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.26620000	-90.28060000
SA-20-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	21.365486	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.26030000	-90.25840000
SB-24-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	835.013628	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.26190000	-90.23080000
SB-05-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	2550.010312	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.24510000	-90.24060000
SA-19-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	22.203434	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.25590000	-90.25870000
SA-06-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	133.658959	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.26160000	-90.23240000
SB-52-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	432.547989	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.24990000	-90.26390000
SB-04-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	2004.933008	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.24780000	-90.24160000
SA-26-EPH	MISSISSIPPI	R6	Linear	59.605479	FOOT	NON-WOTUS-TRIB.NEGATIVE-A5	33.24990000	-90.27700000

Based on the consultant’s report the following emergent wetland does not directly abut a requisite water and is non-jurisdictional.

Waters_Name	State	Cowardin_Code	Meas_Type	Amount	Units	Waters_Type	Latitude	Longitude
WA-06-PEM	MISSISSIPPI	PEM	Area	1.811618	ACRE	NON-WOTUS-WETL.NEGATIVE-A7	33.245181	-90.237783

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 determination based on consultant delineation, (Tetra-Tech.)
- b. GIS Data (Locally created GIS Database consisting of multiple years of AJD’s/PJD’s)
- c. Aerial Photos (Multiple years)
- d. NHD (National Hydrography Dataset)

CEMVK-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), MVK-2025-492

- e. LiDAR (Light imaging, detection, and ranging)
- f. NWI (National Wetland Inventory)
- g. ORM Data (OMBIL Regulatory Module)
- h. Google Earth Pro (multiple years of aerial photos)
- i. USGS Quadrangle Maps

10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION.

Concur with consultant delineation. There are numerous other aquatic resources being addressed via a Preliminary JD to accompany this Approved JD. The Approved JD is only addressing the Non-Jurisdictional features onsite while the Preliminary JD is assuming jurisdiction on all other potentially jurisdictional features.

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.