



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

CEMVS-RD

25 September 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), [MVS-2025-417](#)

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.¹ 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.² For the purposes of this AJD, we have relied on section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (RHA),³ 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 Missouri](#) due to litigation.

¹ 33 CFR 331.2.

² Regulatory Guidance Letter 05-02.

³ 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-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [MVS-2025-417](#)

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. [Pond – \(6.1-acre\). Non-jurisdictional](#)

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 Review Area is the approximately 21.58-acre area located at 837 Forest Circle Trail Road in Ballwin, St. Louis County, Missouri with approximate geographic coordinates 38.546958°, -90.565553°.](#)



4. NEAREST TRADITIONAL NAVIGABLE WATER (TNW), INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS TO WHICH THE AQUATIC RESOURCE IS CONNECTED. [N/A](#)
5. FLOWPATH FROM THE SUBJECT AQUATIC RESOURCES TO A TNW, INTERSTATE WATER, OR THE TERRITORIAL SEAS [N/A](#)
6. SECTION 10 JURISDICTIONAL WATERS⁴: 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 10.⁵ [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): [N/A](#)

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

- 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”).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.

[Pond \(6.1-acre\) is an open water feature likely created in uplands and does not appear to be an impoundment of a tributary. The pond was created sometime between 1970 and 1981 and is currently used for hunting and recreation with no operational functions. There does not appear to be any stream channels entering or leaving the pond, nor any wetlands adjacent to the pond. Therefore, the pond would be considered a “generally non-jurisdictional” preamble water as a body of water created primarily for aesthetic reasons.](#)

[*The pond has separated into multiple, distinct waterbodies due to sediment buildup that occurred between 2020 and 2024.](#)

- 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. [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

⁶ 51 FR 41217, November 13, 1986.

CEMVS-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [MVS-2025-417](#)

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).
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. [Gary R. Weber Associates, Inc. \(GRWA\) Wetland Determination Report, Accessed August 19, 2025](#)
 - b. [USGS Topographic Map \(GRWA Report\), Accessed August 19, 2025](#)
 - c. [USDA-NRCS Soil Survey \(GRWA Report\), Accessed August 19, 2025](#)
 - d. [USFWS National Wetland Inventory \(GRWA Report\), Accessed August 19, 2025](#)
 - e. [LiDAR, Accessed August 19, 2025](#)
 - f. [Google Earth Pro Aerial Imagery, Accessed August 19, 2025](#)
 - g. [Additional Site Photos, Provided by GRWA on September 10, 2025](#)
 - h. [Additional Site Photos, Provided by GRWA on September 23, 2025](#)
 - i. [Antecedent Precipitation Tool \(APT\) Outputs, Provided by GRWA on September 23, 2025](#)

CEMVS-RD

SUBJECT: Pre-2015 Regulatory Regime Approved Jurisdictional Determination in Light of *Sackett v. EPA*, 143 S. Ct. 1322 (2023), [MVS-2025-417](#)

10. OTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION.

A desktop review was conducted by GRWA to establish potential presence and location of any wetlands or other water resources in the review area. The investigation conducted by GRWA consisted of a review of available water resource maps and aerial imagery of the site. The pond is not located in mapped hydric soils or in an area that historically held water before a dam was installed. The pond appears to be isolated.

The National Wetland Inventory (NWI) identifies one (1) open water feature in the location of the pond (PUBGh). The USGS topographic map does not identify any aquatic resources within the review area. The USGS hydrography map does not identify any aquatic resources within the review area. The FEMA flood map identifies the review area outside of the 500-year floodplain.

Historic aerial photographs indicate the following:

Year 1970: No pond or dam is present, and no water is apparent on site.

Year 1981: Dam has been created, and water has ponded.

Year 2020: Impounded pond wasn't separated by sediment buildup.

Year 2024: Current conditions.

The Corps received site photos from the agent via email on September 10 & 23, 2025 at the request of the Corps, primarily to investigate potential drainage from the dam that appeared on lidar images. The agent-provided photos depict a storm structure underneath the railroad tracks southwest of the dam and a drainage path that leads down to it. The photos document the drainage path from southwest of the dam to the storm structure. The photos and APT data indicate that if water does run down this channel, it is likely only for a short duration following rain events. The APT indicated normal or wetter than normal conditions when the photos were taken. The photos of the drainage path did not indicate any recent scour, drift deposits, water-stained leaves, or saturation. Therefore, the pond also lacks a continuous surface connection (CSC) to a requisite water.

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.