



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ST. LOUIS DISTRICT
1222 SPRUCE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63103

CEMVS-OD-F

27 March 2024

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Approved Jurisdictional Determination in accordance with the "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'"; (88 FR 3004 (January 18, 2023) as amended by the "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'; Conforming" (8 September 2023) ,¹ [MVS-2024-141](#)²

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

On January 18, 2023, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of the Army ("the agencies") published the "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States,'" 88 FR 3004 (January 18, 2023) ("2023 Rule"). On September 8, 2023, the agencies published the "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'; Conforming", which amended the 2023 Rule to conform to the 2023 Supreme Court decision in *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S., 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023) ("*Sackett*").

This Memorandum for Record (MFR) constitutes the basis of jurisdiction for a Corps AJD as defined in 33 CFR §331.2. For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),⁵ the 2023 Rule as amended, as well as other applicable guidance, relevant case law, and longstanding practice in evaluating jurisdiction.

¹ While the Revised Definition of "Waters of the United States"; Conforming 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, the territorial seas, or interstate water 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.

CEMVS-OD-F

SUBJECT: 2023 Rule, as amended, Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [MVS-2024-141](#)

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. [Drainage Ditch 1 \(350-linear feet\), non-jurisdictional \(excluded\)](#)

2. REFERENCES.

- a. "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States,'" 88 FR 3004 (January 18, 2023) ("2023 Rule")
- b. "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'; Conforming" 88 FR 61964(September 8, 2023))
- c. *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. __, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023)
- d. [Citing to the 27 September coordination memo, specifically to the language which reads, "Because the Supreme Court in Sackett adopted the Rapanos plurality standard and the 2023 rule preamble discussed the Rapanos plurality standard, the implementation guidance and tools in the 2023 rule preamble that address the regulatory text that was not amended by the conforming rule, including the preamble relevant to the Rapanos plurality standard incorporated in paragraphs \(a\)\(3\), \(4\), and \(5\) of the 2023 rule, as amended, generally remain relevant to implementing the 2023 rule, as amended."](#)

3. REVIEW AREA. [The Review Area is the approximately one-acre footprint of a proposed bike trail crossing located at Latitude 38.5360° and Longitude -89.8770°, south of the Shiloh-Scott MetroLink Station in Shiloh, St. Clair County, Illinois.](#)



CEMVS-OD-F

SUBJECT: 2023 Rule, as amended, Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [MVS-2024-141](#)

4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), THE TERRITORIAL SEAS, OR INTERSTATE WATER TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. [Kaskaskia River](#)
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, THE TERRITORIAL SEAS, OR INTERSTATE WATER. [Drainage from within the Review Area flows east eventually reaching Ash Creek, then Silver Creek before intersecting the Kaskaskia River, a TNW at its downstream extent.](#)
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 [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 2023 Rule as amended, 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 2023 Rule as amended. 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. Traditional Navigable Waters (TNWs) (a)(1)(i): [N/A](#)
 - b. The Territorial Seas (a)(1)(ii): [N/A](#)
 - c. Interstate Waters (a)(1)(iii): [N/A](#)
 - d. Impoundments (a)(2): [N/A](#)
 - e. Tributaries (a)(3): [N/A](#)
 - f. Adjacent Wetlands (a)(4): [N/A](#)
 - g. Additional Waters (a)(5): [N/A](#)

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.

CEMVS-OD-F

SUBJECT: 2023 Rule, as amended, Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [MVS-2024-141](#)

8. NON-JURISDICTIONAL AQUATIC RESOURCES AND FEATURES

a. Describe aquatic resources and other features within the review area identified in the 2023 Rule as amended as not “waters of the United States” even where they otherwise meet the terms of paragraphs (a)(2) through (5). Include the type of excluded aquatic resource or feature, the size of the aquatic resource or feature within the review area and describe how it was determined to meet one of the exclusions listed in 33 CFR 328.3(b).⁸

- [Drainage Ditch 1 \(350 linear feet\) is excluded as a paragraph \(b\)\(3\) water as it is constructed ditch associated with stormwater management for the Shiloh-Scott MetroLink Station and parking lot to the north. The ditch was excavated wholly in and draining only dry land and does not carry a relatively permanent flow of water.](#)

b. 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 2023 Rule as amended (e.g., tributaries that are non-relatively permanent waters; non-tidal wetlands that do not have a continuous surface connection to a jurisdictional water). [N/A](#)

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.

- [USGS Topographic Maps](#)
- [USGS Stream Stats](#)
- [USDA-NRCS Soil Survey](#),
- [USFWS National Wetland Inventory](#)
- [Illinois Height Modernization \(ILHMP\) LiDAR](#)
- [Google Earth Pro Aerial Imagery](#)

10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION.

[The agencies codified an exclusion for ditches \(including roadside ditches\) excavated wholly in and draining only dry lands and that do not carry a relatively permanent flow of water under the 2023 WOTUS Rule, as amended. No available resources indicate the presence of water features prior to the development of the commercial facility nor do the ditches convey relatively permanent flow.](#)

⁸ 88 FR 3004 (January 18, 2023)

CEMVS-OD-F

SUBJECT: 2023 Rule, as amended, Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [MVS-2024-141](#)

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.