



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, TULSA DISTRICT
2488 EAST 81ST STREET
TULSA, OK, 74137-4290

CESWT-RO

4-Dec-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 SWT-2024-00529

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 Oklahoma 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.

CESWT-RO

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWT-2024-00529

- 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. R4SB-1, Unnamed tributary of the North Canadian River, Jurisdictional, Section 404 CWA, 1,214 linear feet
 - ii. PEM1-1, Adjacent Emergent Wetland, Jurisdictional, Section 404 CWA, 0.01 acre
 - iii. R6SB-1, Ephemeral Drainage Feature, Non-RPW, Non-Jurisdictional, 140 linear feet

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)

3. REVIEW AREA. The review area is approximately 10 acres located at Latitude 35.48996, Longitude -97.72366 (at the center of the review area) in Canadian County, Oklahoma.

4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED.

River: North Canadian River
County: McIntosh
Vicinity: Southeast of the town of Henryetta
Landmark: River Mile 35+
Latitude/Longitude: 35.420005, -95.807013

5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS. The unnamed tributary of

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWT-2024-00529

the North Canadian River flows to the North Canadian River, then to the navigable location of the North Canadian River described in Section 4.

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
 - e. Tributaries (a)(5): R4SB-1 – The unnamed tributary of the North Canadian River is indicated as an intermittent, dashed blue line stream on the USGS Topographic Map and USGS NHD and is observable on aerial imagery. The

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.

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWT-2024-00529

physical stream location doesn't exactly align with the USGS Topographic and USGS NHD mapped feature alignment due to the past site development activities. It flows through the review area from the north through a reinforced concrete box (RCB) culvert for approximately 125 linear feet to entrance of an RCP. The stream was previously diverted in the past into a reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) culvert and covered with fill material for approximately 447 linear feet. The stream flows for another 642 linear feet from where it exits the RCP to the eastern end of the review area. The requestor's delineation delineated the stream as two separate fragments upstream and downstream of the RCP, however, the RCP provides a continuous surface connection and allows water to pass through to the stream segment downstream of the RCP. Additionally, according to the requestor's delineation, the stream contained pooled and slightly flowing water with *Lepomis* spp. and *Gambusia affinis* within pool habitat.

- f. The territorial seas (a)(6): N/A
- g. Adjacent wetlands (a)(7): PEM1-1 – The requestor's delineation identified this emergent wetland as being created by a scour pool downstream of a RCB road crossing (South Yukon Parkway). It is adjacent to the unnamed tributary of the North Canadian River and meets the required 3 wetland indicators.

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.

N/A

⁷ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWT-2024-00529

- 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).
R6SB1 – The ephemeral drainage feature is a non-relatively permanent water. It is not indicated on the USGS Topographic Map and USGS NHD as a mapped stream. The requestors delineation indicated the feature collects storm water from southwest adjoining properties, southwest adjoining road and railroad grade, and is a relatively narrow and shallow cut channel along the western edge of the study area. Its total length is 265 linear feet (including outside of the review area).
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. The requestor’s Lentic and Lotic Waterbody and Wetland Delineation Study dated September 14, 2024.
 - b. USGS Topographic Map, accessed December 4, 2024

CESWT-RO

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), SWT-2024-00529

- c. USGS NHD, accessed December 4, 2024
- d. USFWS NWI, accessed December 4, 2024
- e. Google Earth, accessed 12/4/2024

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.



US Army Corps
of Engineers®
Tulsa District




Approved Jurisdictional Determination

SWT-2024-00529



Legend

- Review Area
- PEM11 - Jurisdictional - Adjacent Wetland
- R45B1 - Jurisdictional, RPW
- R45B1 - Jurisdictional, RPW: RCB Location
- R45B1 - Jurisdictional, RPW: Buried RCP Culvert - Estimated Location
- R65B1 - Non-Jurisdictional, Non-RPW



Esri Community Maps Contributors, City of Oklahoma City, Texas Parks & Wildlife, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc., METI/NASA, USGS, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS, Maxar, Microsoft, Map data © OpenStreetMap contributors, Microsoft, Facebook, Inc. and its affiliates, Esri Community Maps contributors, Map layer by Esri, Copyright: © 2013 National Geographic Society, i-cubed