PMHarrisCOL PEmails

From: Matthews, Monte K SAW [Monte.K.Matthews@saw02.usace.army.mil]
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 3:33 PM
To: Donald Palmrose
Subject: 404(b)(1) Guidelines
Attachments: 404(b)(1).pdf

Hello Don,

As promised, please find attached a copy of the MOA between EPA and the Corps discussing the 404(b)(1) Guidelines. This is a pretty good description of our regulatory requirements.

If you need anything else, just let me know.

Monte

Hearing Identifier: ShearonHarris_COL_Public
Email Number: 111

Mail Envelope Properties (3A4ADFAFE2E7644BADF6D25D63392F092A1422)

Subject: 404(b)(1) Guidelines
Sent Date: 9/18/2008 3:32:48 PM
Received Date: 9/18/2008 3:35:29 PM
From: Matthews, Monte K SAW

Created By: Monte.K.Matthews@saw02.usace.army.mil

Recipients:
"Donald Palmrose" <Donald.Palmrose@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: saw-ml1wil.saw.ds.usace.army.mil

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	269	9/18/2008 3:35:29 PM
404(b)(1).pdf	322827	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
The Department of the Army
AND
The Environmental Protection Agency
CONCERNING
THE DETERMINATION OF MITIGATION UNDER THE CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 404(b)(1) GUIDELINES

I. PURPOSE

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the United States Department of the Army (Army) hereby articulate the policy and procedures to be used in the determination of the type and level of mitigation necessary to demonstrate compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines ("Guidelines"). This Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) expresses the explicit intent of the Army and EPA to implement the objective of the CWA to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Nation's waters, including wetlands. This MOA is specifically limited to the Section 404 Regulatory Program and is written to provide guidance for agency field personnel on the type and level of mitigation which demonstrates compliance with requirements in the Guidelines. The policies and procedures discussed herein are consistent with current Section 404 regulatory practices and are provided in response to questions that have been raised about how the Guidelines are implemented. The MOA does not change the substantive requirements of the Guidelines. It is intended to provide guidance regarding the exercise of discretion under the Guidelines.

Although the Guidelines are clearly applicable to all discharges of dredged or fill material, including general permits and Corps of Engineers (Corps) civil works projects, this MOA focuses on standard permits (33 CFR325(b)(1)).[1] This focus is intended solely to reflect the unique procedural aspects associated with the review of standard permits, and does not obviate the need for other regulated activities to comply fully with the Guidelines. EPA and Army will seek to develop supplemental guidance for other regulated activities consistent with the policies and principles established in this document.

This MOA provides guidance to Corps and EPA personnel for implementing the Guidelines and must be adhered to when considering mitigation requirements for standard permit applications. The Corps will use this MOA when making its determinations of compliance with the Guidelines with respect to mitigation for standard permit applications. EPA will use this MOA in developing its position on compliance with the Guidelines for proposed discharges and will reflect this MOA when commenting on standard permit applications.

II. POLICY

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has defined mitigation in its regulations at 40

CFR 1508.20 to include: avoiding impacts, minimizing impacts, rectifying impacts, reducing impacts over time, and compensating for impacts. The Guidelines establish environmental criteria which must be met for activities to be permitted under Section 404. [2] The type of mitigation enumerated by CEQ are compatible with the requirements of the Guidelines; however, as a practical matter, they can be combined to form three general types: avoidance, minimization and compensatory mitigation. The remainder of this MOA will speak in terms of these general types of mitigation.

The Clean Water Act and the Guidelines set forth a goal of restoring and maintaining existing aquatic resources. The Corps will strive to avoid adverse impacts and offset unavoidable adverse impacts to existing aquatic resources, and for wetlands, will strive to achieve a goal of no overall net loss of values and functions. In focusing the goal on no overall net loss to wetlands only, EPA and Army have explicitly recognized the special significance of the nation's wetlands resources. This special recognition of wetlands resources does not in any manner diminish the value of other waters of the United States, which are often of high value. All waters of the United States, such as streams, rivers, lakes, etc., will be accorded the full measure of protection under the Guidelines, including the requirements for appropriate and practicable mitigation. The determination of what level of mitigation constitutes "appropriate" mitigation is based solely on the values and functions of the aquatic resource that will be impacted. "Practicable" is defined at Section 230.3(q) of the Guidelines.[3] However, the level of mitigation determined to be appropriate and practicable under Section 230.10(d) may lead to individual permit decisions which do not fully meet this goal because the mitigation measures necessary to meet this goal are not feasible, not practicable, or would accomplish only inconsequential reductions in impacts. Consequently, it is recognized that no net loss of wetlands functions and values may not be achieved in each and every permit action. However, it remains a goal of the Section 404 regulatory program to contribute to the national goal of no overall net loss of the nation's remaining wetlands base. EPA and Army are committed to working with others through the Administration's interagency task force and other avenues to help achieve this national goal.

In evaluating standard Section 404 permit applications, as a practical matter, information on all facets of a project, including potential mitigation, is typically gathered and reviewed at the same time. The Corps, except as indicated below, first makes a determination that potential impact have been avoided to the maximum extent practicable; remaining unavoidable impacts will then be mitigated to the extent appropriate and practicable by requiring steps to minimize impacts, and, finally, compensate for aquatic resource values. This sequence is considered satisfied where the proposed mitigation is in accordance with specific provisions of a Corps and EPA approved comprehensive plan that ensures compliance with the compensation requirements of the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (examples of such comprehensive plans may include Special Area Management Plans, Advanced Identification areas (Section 230.80) and State Coastal Zone Management Plans). It may be appropriate to deviate from the sequence when EPA and the Corps agree the proposed discharge is necessary to avoid environmental harm (e.g. to protect a natural aquatic community from saltwater intrusion, chemical contamination, or other deleterious physical or chemical impacts), or EPA and the Corps agree that the proposed discharge can reasonably be expected to result in environmental gain or insignificant environmental losses.

In determining "appropriate and practicable" measures to offset unavoidable impact, such measures should be appropriate to the scope and degree of those impacts and practicable in terms of cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes. The Corps will give full consideration to the views of the resource agencies when making this determination.

Avoidance.[4] Section 230.10(a) allows permit issuance for only the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. [5] The thrust of this section on alternatives is avoidance of impacts. Section 230.10(a) requires that no discharge shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact to the aquatic ecosystem, so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences. In addition, Section 230.10(a)(3) sets forth rebuttable presumptions that 1) alternatives for non-water dependent activities that do not involve special aquatic sites [6] are available and 2) alternatives that do not involve special aquatic sites have less adverse impact on the aquatic environment. Compensatory mitigation may not be used as a method to reduce environmental impacts in the evaluation of the least environmentally damaging practicable alternatives for the purposes of requirements under Section 230.10(a).

Minimization. Section 230.10(d) states that appropriate and practicable steps to minimize the adverse impacts will be required through project modifications and permit conditions. Subpart H of the Guidelines describes several (but not all) means of minimizing impacts of an activity.

Compensatory Mitigation. Appropriate and practicable compensatory mitigation is required for unavoidable adverse impacts which remain after all appropriate and practicable minimization has been required. Compensatory actions (e.g., restoration of existing degraded wetlands or creation of man-made wetlands) should be undertaken when practicable, in areas adjacent or continuous to the discharge site (on-site compensatory mitigation). If on-site compensatory mitigation is not practicable, off-site compensatory mitigation should be undertaken in the same geographic area if practicable (i.e., in close proximity and, to the extent possible, the same watershed). In determining compensatory mitigation, the functional values lost by the resource to be impacted must be considered. Generally, in-kind compensatory mitigation is preferable to out-of-kind. There is continued uncertainty regarding the success of wetland creation or other habitat development. Therefore, in determining the nature and extent of habitat development of this type, careful consideration should be given to its likelihood of success. Because the likelihood of success is greater and the impacts to potentially valuable uplands are reduced, restoration should be the first option considered.

In the situation where the Corps is evaluating a project where a permit issued by another agency requires compensatory mitigation, the Corps may consider that mitigation as part of the overall application for purposes of public notice, but avoidance and minimization shall still be sought.

Mitigation banking may be an acceptable form of compensatory mitigation under specific criteria designed to ensure an environmentally successful bank. Where a mitigation bank has been approved by EPA and the Corps for purposes of providing compensatory mitigation for specific identified projects, use of that mitigation bank for those particular projects is considered as meeting the objective of Section II.C.3 of this MOA, regardless of the practicability of other

forms of compensatory mitigation. Additional guidance on mitigation banking will be provided. Simple purchase or "preservation" of existing wetlands resources may in only exceptional circumstances be accepted as compensatory mitigation. EPA and Army will develop specific guidance for preservation in the context of compensatory mitigation at a later date.

III. OTHER PROCEDURES

Potential applicants for major projects should be encouraged to arrange preapplication meetings with the Corps and appropriate federal, state, or Indian tribal, and local authorities to determine requirements and documentation required for proposed permit evaluations. As a result of such meetings, the applicant often revises a proposal to avoid or minimize adverse impacts after developing an understanding of the Guidelines requirements by which a future Section 404 permit decision will be made, in addition to gaining understanding of other state or tribal, or local requirements. Compliance with other statutes, requirements and reviews, such as NEPA and the Corps public interest review, may not in and of themselves satisfy the requirements prescribed in the Guidelines.

In achieving the goals of the CWA, the Corps will strive to avoid adverse impacts and offset unavoidable adverse impacts to existing aquatic resources. Measures which can accomplish this can be identified only through resource assessments tailored to the site performed by qualified professionals because ecological characteristics of each aquatic site are unique. Functional values should be assessed by applying aquatic site assessment techniques generally recognized by experts in the field and/or the best professional judgement of federal and state agency representatives, provided such assessments fully consider ecological functions included in the Guidelines. The objective of mitigation for unavoidable impacts is to offset environmental losses. Additionally for wetlands, such mitigation should provide, at a minimum, one for one functional replacement (i.e., no net loss of values), with an adequate margin of safety to reflect the expected degree of success associated with the mitigation plan, recognizing that this minimum requirement may not be appropriate and practicable and thus may not be relevant in all cases, as discussed in Section II.B of this MOA.[7] In the absence of more definitive information on the functions and values of specific wetland sites, a minimum of 1 to 1 acreage replacement may be used as a reasonable surrogate for no net loss of functions and values. However, this ratio may be greater where the functional values of the area being impacted are demonstrably high and the replacement wetlands are of lower functional value or the likelihood of success of the mitigation project is low. Conversely, the ration may be less than 1 to 1 for areas where the functional values associated with the area being impacted are demonstrably low and the likelihood of success associated with the mitigation proposal is high.

The Guidelines are the environmental standards for Section 404 permit issuance under the CWA. Aspects of a proposed project may be affected through a determination of requirements needed to comply with the Guidelines to achieve these CWA environmental goals.

Monitoring is an important aspect of mitigation, especially in areas of scientific uncertainty. Monitoring should be directed toward determining whether permit conditions are complied with and whether the purpose intended to be served by the conditions are actually achieved. Any time

it is determined that a permittee is in non-compliance with the mitigation requirements of the permit, the Corps will take action in accordance with 33 CFR Part 326. Monitoring should not be required for purposes other than these, although information for other uses may accrue from the monitoring requirements. For projects to be permitted involving mitigation with higher levels of scientific uncertainty, such as some forms of compensatory mitigation, long term monitoring, reporting and potential remedial action should be required. This can be required of the applicant through permit conditions.

Mitigation requirements shall be conditions of standard Section 404 permits. Army regulations authorize mitigation requirements to be added as special conditions to an Army permit to satisfy legal requirements (e.g. conditions necessary to satisfy the Guidelines) [33 CFR 325.4(a)]. This ensures legal enforceability of the mitigation conditions and enhances the level of compliance. If the mitigation plan necessary to ensure compliance with the Guidelines is not reasonable implementable or enforceable, the permit shall be denied.

Nothing in this document, is intended to diminish, modify or otherwise affect the statutory or regulatory authorities of the agencies involved. Furthermore, formal policy guidance on or interpretation of this document shall be issued jointly.

This MOA shall take affect on February 8, 1990, and will apply to those completed standard permit applications which are received on or after that date. This MOA may be modified or revoked by agreement of both parties, or revoked by either party alone upon six (6) months written notice.

Robert W. Page /s/
Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works
February 6, 1990

LaJuna S. Wilcher /s/
Assistant Administrator for Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
February 6, 1990

[1] Standard permits are those individual permits which have been processed through application of the Corps public interest review procedures (33 CFR 325) and EPA's Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, including public notice and receipt of comments. Standard permits do not include letters of permission, regional permits, nationwide permits, or programmatic permits.

[2](except where Section 404(b)(2) applies).

[3] Section 230.3(q) of the Guidelines reads as follows: " The term practicable means available and capable of being done after taking into consideration *cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes."* (Emphasis supplied.)

[4]Avoidance as used in Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines and this MOA does not include compensatory mitigation.

[5]It is important to recognize that there are circumstances where the impacts of the project are so significant that even if alternatives are not available, the discharge may not be permitted regardless of the compensatory mitigation proposed (40 CFR 230.10(c)).

[6]Special aquatic sites include sanctuaries and refuges, wetlands, mud flats, vegetated shallows, coral reefs and riffle pool complexes.

[7] For example, there are certain areas where, due to hydrological conditions, the technology for restoration or creation of wetlands may not be available at present, or may otherwise be impracticable. In addition, avoidance, minimization, and compensatory mitigation may not be practicable where there is a high proportion of land which is wetlands. EPA and Army, at present, are discussing with representatives of the oil industry, the potential for a program of accelerated rehabilitation of abandoned oil facilities on the North Slope to serve as a vehicle for satisfying necessary compensation requirements.