

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463) announcement is made of the following committee meeting.

Name: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC) Advisory Committee.

Date: 5-7 April 1995.

Place: Bell Hall, Room 113, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-6900.

Time: 1700-2200—5 April 1995, 0730-2100—6 April 1995, 0730-1400—7 April 1995.

Proposed Agenda: 1700-2200, 5 April: Review of CGSC educational program. 0730-2100, 6 April: Continuation of review. 0730-1030, 7 April: Continuation of review. 1030-1130, 7 April: Executive Session. 1300-1400, 7 April: Report to Commandant

The purpose of the meeting is for the Advisory Committee to examine the entire range of college operations and, where appropriate, to provide advice and recommendations to the College Commandant and faculty.

The meeting will be open to the public to the extent that space limitations of the meeting location permit. Because of these limitations, interested parties are requested to reserve space by contacting the Committee's Executive Secretary: Philip J. Brooks, USACGSC Advisory Committee, Bell Hall, Room 123, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-6900; Phone: (913) 684-2741.

Kenneth L. Denton,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-6180 Filed 3-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

Corps of Engineers

Regulatory Guidance Letters Issued by the Corps of Engineers

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to provide current Regulatory Guidance Letters (RGL's) to all interested parties. RGL's are used by the Corps Headquarters as a means to transmit guidance on the permit program (33 CFR 320-330) to its division and district engineers (DE's). Each future RGL will be published in the Notice Section of the **Federal Register** as a means to insure the widest dissemination of this information while reducing costs to the Federal Government. The Corps no longer maintains a mailing list to furnish copies of the RGL's to the public.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ralph Eppard, Regulatory Branch, Office of the Chief of Engineers at (202) 272-1783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: RGL's were developed by the Corps of Engineers as a system to organize and

track written guidance issued to its field agencies. RGL's are normally issued as a result of evolving policy; judicial decisions and changes to the Corps regulations or another agency's regulations which affect the permit program. RGL's are used only to interpret or clarify existing regulatory program policy, but do provide mandatory guidance to Corps district offices. RGL's are sequentially numbered and expire on a specified date. However, unless superseded by specific provisions of subsequently issued regulations or RGL's, the guidance provided in RGL's generally remains valid after the expiration date. The Corps incorporates most of the guidance provided by RGL's whenever it revises its permit regulations. There were two RGL's issued by the Corps during 1994, and both were published in the Notice Section of the **Federal Register** upon issuance. We are hereby publishing all current RGL's, beginning with RGL 91-1 and ending with RGL 94-2. We will continue to publish each RGL in the Notice Section of the **Federal Register** upon issuance and in early 1996, we will again publish the complete list of all current RGL's.

Dated: February 6, 1995.

James E. Crews,

Acting Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL 91-1)

RGL 91-1 DATE: Dec 31, 1991 EXPIRES: Dec 31, 1996

SUBJECT: Extensions of Time For Individual Permit Authorizations

1. The purpose of this guidance is to provide clarification for district and division offices relating to extensions of time for Department of the Army permits (See 33 CFR 325.6).

2. *General:* A permittee is informed of the time limit for completing an authorized activity by General Condition #1 of the standard permit form (ENG Form 1721). This condition states that a request for an extension of time should be submitted to the authorizing official at least one month prior to the expiration date. This request should be in writing and should explain the basis of the request. The DE may consider an oral request from the permittee provided it is followed up with a written request prior to the expiration date. A request for an extension of time will usually be granted unless the DE determines that the time extension would be contrary to the public interest. The one month submittal requirement is a workload management time limit designed to prevent permittees from filing last minute time extension requests. Obviously, the one month period is not sufficient to make a final decision on all time extension requests that are processed in accordance with 33 CFR 325.2. It should be noted that a permittee may choose to request a time extension sooner than this (e.g., six

months prior to the expiration date). While there is no formal time limit of this nature, a request for an extension of time should generally not be considered by the DE more than one year prior to the expiration date. A permit will automatically expire if an extension is not requested and granted prior to the applicable expiration date (See 33 CFR 325.6(d)).

3. *Requests for Time Extensions Prior to Expiration:* For requests of time extensions received prior to the expiration date, the DE should consider the following procedures if a decision on the request cannot be completed prior to the permit expiration date:

(a) The DE may grant an interim time extension while a final decision is being made; or

(b) The DE may, when appropriate, suspend the permit at the same time that an interim time extension is granted, while a final decision is being made.

4. *Requests for Time Extensions After Expiration:* A time extension cannot be granted if a time extension request is received after the applicable time limit. In such cases, a new permit application must be processed, if the permittee wishes to pursue the work. However, the DE may consider expedited processing procedures when: (1) The request is received shortly (generally 30 days) after the expiration date, (2) the DE determines that there have been no substantial changes in the attendant circumstances since the original authorization was issued, and (3) the DE believes that the time extension would likely have been granted. Expedited processing procedures may include, but are not limited to, not requiring that a new application form be submitted or issuing a 15 day public notice.

5. This guidance expires 31 December 1996 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division Directorate of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL 92-1)

RGL 92-1 Date: 13 May 1992, Expires: 31 December 1997

Subject: Federal Agencies Roles and Responsibilities.

1. *Purpose:* The purpose of this guidance is to clarify the Army Corps of Engineers leadership and decision-making role as "project manager" for the evaluation of permit applications pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. This guidance is also intended to encourage effective and efficient coordination among prospective permittees, the Corps, and the Federal resource agencies (i.e., Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)). Implementation of this guidance will help to streamline the permit process by minimizing delays and ensuring more timely decisions, while providing a meaningful opportunity for substantive input from all Federal agencies.

2. *Background:* (a) The Department of the Army Regulatory Program must operate in an

efficient manner in order to protect the aquatic environment and provide fair, equitable, and timely decisions to the regulated public. Clear leadership and a predictable decision-making framework will enhance the public acceptance of the program and allow the program to meet the important objective of effectively protecting the Nation's valuable aquatic resources.

(b) On August 9, 1991, the President announced a comprehensive plan for improving the protection of the Nation's wetlands. The plan seeks to balance two important objectives—the protection, restoration, and creation of wetlands and the need for sustained economic growth and development. The plan, which is designed to slow and eventually stop the net loss of wetlands, includes measures that will improve and streamline the current wetlands regulatory system. This Regulatory Guidance Letter is issued in accordance with the President's plan for protecting wetlands.

(c) The intent of this guidance is to express clearly that the Corps is the decision-maker and project manager for the Department of Army's Regulatory Program. The Corps will consider, to the maximum extent possible, all timely, project-related comments from other Federal agencies when making regulatory decisions. Furthermore, the Corps and relevant Federal agencies will maintain and improve as necessary their working relationships.

(d) The Federal resource agencies have reviewed and concurred with this guidance and have agreed to act in accordance with these provisions. While this guidance does not restrict or impair the exercise of legal authorities vested in the Federal resource agencies or States under the CWA or other statutes and regulations (e.g., EPA's authority under section 404(c), section 404(f), and CWA geographic jurisdiction and FWS/NMFS authorities under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Endangered Species Act (ESA)), agency comments on Department of the Army permit applications must be consistent with the provisions contained in this regulatory guidance letter.

3. The Corps Project Management/Decision Making Role: (a) The Corps is solely responsible for making final permit decisions pursuant to section 10 and section 404(a), including final determinations of compliance with the Corps permit regulations, the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, and Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. As such, the Corps will act as the project manager for the evaluation of all permit applications. The Corps will advise potential applicants of its role as the project manager and decision-maker. This guidance does not restrict EPA's authority to make determinations of compliance with the Guidelines in carrying out its responsibilities under Sections 309 and 404(c) of the Clean Water Act.

(b) As the project manager, the Corps is responsible for requesting and evaluating information concerning all permit applications. The Corps will obtain and utilize this information in a manner that moves, as rapidly as practical, the regulatory process towards a final permit decision. The Corps will not evaluate applications as a

project opponent or advocate—but instead will maintain an objective evaluation, fully considering all relevant factors.

(c) The Corps will fully consider other Federal agencies' project-related comments when determining compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, the ESA, the National Historic Preservation Act, and other relevant statutes, regulations, and policies. The Corps will also fully consider the agencies' views when determining whether to issue the permit, to issue the permit with conditions and/or mitigation, or to deny the permit.

4. The Federal Resource Agencies' Role: (a) It is recognized that the Federal resource agencies have an important role in the Department of the Army Regulatory Program under the CWA, NEPA, ESA, Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, and other relevant statutes.

(b) When providing comments, Federal resource agencies will submit to the Corps only substantive, project-related information on the impacts of activities being evaluated by the Corps and appropriate and practicable measures to mitigate adverse impacts. The comments will be submitted within the time frames established in interagency agreements and regulations. Federal resource agencies will limit their comments to their respective areas of expertise and authority to avoid duplication with the Corps and other agencies and to provide the Corps with a sound basis for making permit decisions. The Federal resource agencies should not submit comments that attempt to interpret the Corps regulations or for the purposes of section 404(a) make determinations concerning compliance with the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Pursuant to its authority under Section 404(b)(1) of the CWA, the EPA may provide comments to the Corps identifying its views regarding compliance with the Guidelines. While the Corps will fully consider and utilize agency comments, the final decision regarding the permit application, including a determination of compliance with the Guidelines, rests solely with the Corps.

5. Pre-Application Consultation: (a) To provide potential applicants with the maximum degree of relevant information at an early phase of project planning, the Corps will increase its efforts to encourage pre-application consultations in accordance with regulations at 33 CFR 325.1(b). Furthermore, while encouraging pre-application consultation, the Corps will emphasize the need for early consultation concerning mitigation requirements, if impacts to aquatic resources may occur. The Corps is responsible for initiating, coordinating, and conducting pre-application consultations and other discussions and meetings with applicants regarding Department of the Army permits. This may not apply in instances where the consultation is associated with the review of a separate permit or license required from another Federal agency (e.g., the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission) or in situations where resource agencies perform work for others outside the context of a specific Department of the Army permit

application (e.g., the Conservation Reserve Program and technical assistance to applicants of Federal grants).

(b) For those pre-application consultations involving activities that may result in impacts to aquatic resources, the Corps will provide EPA, FWS, NMFS (as appropriate), and other appropriate Federal and State agencies, a reasonable opportunity to participate in the pre-application process. The invited agencies will participate to the maximum extent possible in the pre-application consultation, since this is generally the best time to consider alternatives for avoiding or reducing adverse impacts. To the extent practical, the Corps and the Federal resource agencies will develop local procedures (e.g., teleconferencing) to promote reasonable and effective pre-application consultations within the logistical constraints of all affected parties.

6. Applications for Individual Permits: (a) The Corps is responsible for determining the need for, and the coordination of, interagency meetings, requests for information, and other interactions between permit applicants and the Federal Government. In this regard, Federal resource agencies will contact the Corps to discuss and coordinate any additional need for information from the applicant. The Corps will cooperate with the Federal resource agencies to ensure, to the extent practical, that information necessary for the agencies to carry out their responsibilities is obtained. If it is determined by the Corps that an applicant meeting is necessary for the exchange of information with a Federal resource agency and the Corps chooses not to participate in such a meeting, the Federal resource agency will apprise the Corps, generally in writing, of that agency's discussions with the applicant. Notwithstanding such meetings, the Corps is solely responsible for permit requirements, including mitigation and other conditions—the Federal resource agencies must not represent their views as regulatory requirements. In circumstances where the Corps meets with the applicant and develops information that will affect the permit decision, the Corps will apprise the Federal resource agencies of such information.

(b) Consistent with 33 CFR 325, the Corps will ensure that public notices contain sufficient information to facilitate the timely submittal of project-specific comments from the Federal resource agencies. The resource agencies comments will provide specific information and/or data related to the proposed project site. The Corps will fully consider comments regarding the site from a watershed or landscape scale, including an evaluation of potential cumulative and secondary impacts.

(c) The Corps must consider cumulative impacts in reaching permit decisions. In addition to the Corps own expertise and experience, the Corps will fully consider comments from the Federal resource agencies, which can provide valuable information on cumulative impacts. Interested Federal agencies are encouraged to provide periodically to the Corps generic comments and assessments of impacts (outside the context of a specific permit

application) on issues within the agencies' area of expertise.

7. General Permits:

(a) The Corps is responsible for proposing potential general permits, assessing impacts of and comments on proposed general permits, and deciding whether to issue general permits. The Corps will consider proposals for general permits from other sources, including the Federal resource agencies, although the final decision regarding the need to propose a general permit rests with the Corps. Other interested Federal agencies should provide comments to the Corps on proposed general permits. These Federal agency comments will be submitted consistent with established agreements and regulations and will focus on the Federal agencies' area(s) of expertise. The Corps will fully consider such agencies' comments in deciding whether to issue general permits, including programmatic general permits.

(b) The Corps is responsible for initiating and conducting meetings that may be necessary in developing and evaluating potential general permits. Any discussions with a State or local Government regarding proposed programmatic general permits will be coordinated through and conducted by the Corps. Prior to issuing a programmatic general permit, the Corps will ensure that the State or local program, by itself or with appropriate conditions, will protect the aquatic environment, including wetlands, to the level required by the section 404 program.

8. This guidance expires 31 December 1997 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Commander:

Arthur E. Williams,

Major General, USA, Director of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (92-2)

RGL 92-2 Date: 26 June 92 Expires: 31

December 95 CECW-OR

Subject: Water Dependency and Cranberry Production

1. Enclosed for implementation is a joint Army Corps of Engineers/Environmental Protection Agency Memorandum to the Field on water dependency and cranberry production. This guidance was developed jointly by the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

2. This guidance will expire 31 December 1995 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Memorandum to the Field

SUBJECT: Water Dependency and Cranberry Production

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to clarify the applicability of the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines water dependency provisions (40 CFR 230.10(a)) to the cultivation of cranberries, in light of Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) regulations at 33 CFR 323.4(a)(1)(iii)(C)(1) (ii) and (iii), and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations at 40 CFR 232.3(d)(3)(i) (B) and

(C). These sections of the Corps and EPA regulations state, among other things, that cranberries are a wetland crop, and that some discharges associated with cranberry production are considered exempt from regulation under the provisions of Section 404(f) of the Clean Water Act. The characterization of cranberries as a wetland crop has led to inconsistency in determining if cranberry production is a water dependent activity as defined in the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (Guidelines).

2. The intent of Corps regulations at 33 CFR 320.4(b) and of the Guidelines is to avoid the unnecessary destruction or alteration of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, and to compensate for the unavoidable loss of such waters. The Guidelines specifically require that "no discharge of dredged or fill material shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences" (see 40 CFR 230.10(a)). Based on this provision, an evaluation is required in every case for use of non-aquatic areas and other aquatic sites that would result in less adverse impact to the aquatic ecosystem, irrespective of whether the discharge site is a special aquatic site or whether the activity associated with the discharge is water dependent. A permit cannot be issued, therefore, in circumstances where an environmentally preferable practicable alternative for the proposed discharge exists (except as provided for under Section 404(b)(2)).

3. For proposed discharges into wetlands and other "special aquatic sites," the Guidelines alternatives analysis requirement further considers whether the activity associated with the proposed discharge is "water dependent". The Guidelines define water dependency in terms of an activity requiring access or proximity to or siting within a special aquatic site to fulfill its basic project purpose. Special aquatic sites (as defined in 40 CFR 230.40-230.45) are: (1) sanctuaries and refuges; (2) wetlands; (3) mud flats; (4) vegetated shallows; (5) coral reefs; and (6) riffle and pool complexes. If an activity is determined not to be water dependent, the Guidelines establish the following two presumptions (40 CFR 230.10(a)(3)) that the applicant is required to rebut before satisfying the alternatives analysis requirements:

a. that practicable alternatives that do not involve special aquatic sites are presumed to be available; and,

b. that all practicable alternatives to the proposed discharge which do not involve a discharge into a special aquatic site are presumed to have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to clearly rebut these presumptions in order to demonstrate compliance with the Guidelines alternatives test.

4. If an activity is determined to be water dependent, the rebuttable presumptions stated in paragraph 3 of this memorandum do not apply. However, the proposed discharge, whether or not it is associated with a water

dependent activity, must represent the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative in order to comply with the alternatives analysis requirement of the Guidelines as described in paragraph 2 of this memorandum.

5. As previously indicated, Corps and EPA regulations consider cranberries as a wetland crop species. This characterization of cranberries as a wetland crop species is based primarily on the listing of cranberries as an obligate hydrophyte in the National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 88 (26.1-26.13)) and the fact that cranberries must be grown in wetlands or areas altered to create a wetland environment. Therefore, the Corps and EPA consider the construction of cranberry beds, including associated dikes and water control structures associated with dikes (i.e., headgates, weirs, drop inlet structures), to be a water dependent activity. Consequently, discharges directly associated with cranberry bed construction are not subject to the presumptions applicable to non-water dependent activities discussed in paragraph 3 of this memorandum. However, consistent with the requirements of Section 230.10(a), the proposed discharge must represent the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, after considering aquatic and non-aquatic alternatives as appropriate. To be considered practicable, an alternative must be available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes. For commercial cranberry cultivation, practicable alternatives may include upland sites with proper characteristics for creating the necessary conditions to grow cranberries. Factors that must be considered in making a determination of whether or not upland alternatives are practicable include soil pH, topography, soil permeability, depth to bedrock, depth to seasonal high water table, adjacent land uses, water supply, and, for expansion of existing cranberry operations, proximity to existing cranberry farms. EPA Regions and Corps Districts are encouraged to work together with local cranberry growers to refine these factors to reflect their regional conditions.

6. In contrast, the following activities often associated with the cultivation and harvesting of cranberries are not considered water dependent: construction of roads, ditches, reservoirs, and pump houses that are used during the cultivation of cranberries, and construction of secondary support facilities for shipping, storage, packaging, parking, etc. Therefore, the rebuttable practicable alternatives presumptions discussed in paragraph 3 of this memorandum apply to the discharges associated with these non-water dependent activities. However, since determinations of practicability under the Guidelines includes consideration of cost, technical, and logistics factors, determining the availability of practicable alternatives to discharges associated with these non-water dependent activities must involve consideration of the need of an alternative to be proximate to the cranberry bed in order to achieve the basic project purpose of cranberry cultivation.

Once it has been determined that the location of the cranberry bed, including associated dikes, and water control structures, represents the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, practicable alternatives for maintenance roads, ditches, reservoirs and pump houses will generally be limited to the bed itself and the area in the vicinity of the actual bed. For example, the bed dikes may be the only practicable alternative for location of maintenance roads. When practicable alternatives cannot be identified within such geographic constraints, the applicant must minimize the impacts of the roads, reservoirs, etc., to the maximum extent practicable.

7. During review of applications for discharges associated with cranberry cultivation, it is important to reiterate that proposed discharges must also comply with the other requirements of the Guidelines (i.e., 40 CFR 230.10 (b), (c) and (d)). In addition, evaluations of all discharges, whether or not the proposed discharge is associated with a water dependent activity, must comply with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, including an investigation of alternatives to the proposed discharge. Further, applications for discharges associated with cranberry cultivation will continue to be evaluated in accordance with current Corps and EPA policy and practice concerning mitigation, cumulative impact analysis, and public interest review factors.

8. This guidance expires 31 December 1995 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

Robert H. Wayland III,

Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

John P. Elmore,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (92-3)

RGL 92-3 DATE: 19 Aug 92 EXPIRES: 31 Dec 97

SUBJECT: Extension of Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) 86-10

RGL 86-10, subject: "Special Area Management Plans (SAMP's)" is extended until 31 December 1997 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

RGL 86-10

Special Area Management Plans (SAMP's)
Issued 10/2/86 Expired 12/31/88

1. The 1980 Amendments to the Coastal Zone Management Act define the SAMP process as "a comprehensive plan providing for natural resource protection and reasonable coastal-dependent economic growth containing a detailed and comprehensive statement of policies, standards and criteria to guide public and private uses of lands and waters; and mechanisms for timely implementation in specific geographic areas within the coastal

zone." This process of collaborative interagency planning within a geographic area of special sensitivity is just as applicable in non-coastal areas.

2. A good SAMP reduces the problems associated with the traditional case-by-case review. Developmental interests can plan with predictability and environmental interests are assured that individual and cumulative impacts are analyzed in the context of broad ecosystem needs.

3. Because SAMP's are very labor intensive, the following ingredients should usually exist before a district engineer becomes involved in a SAMP:

a. The area should be environmentally sensitive and under strong developmental pressure.

b. There should be a sponsoring local agency to ensure that the plan fully reflects local needs and interests.

c. Ideally there should be full public involvement in the planning and development process.

d. All parties must express a willingness at the outset to conclude the SAMP process with a definitive regulatory product (see next paragraph).

4. An ideal SAMP would conclude with two products: 1) appropriate local/State approvals and a Corps general permit (GP) or abbreviated processing procedure (APP) for activities in specifically defined situations; and 2) a local/State restriction and/or an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 404(c) restriction (preferably both) for undesirable activities. An individual permit review may be conducted for activities that do not fall into either category above.

However, it should represent a small number of the total cases addressed by the SAMP. We recognize that an ideal SAMP is difficult to achieve, and, therefore, it is intended to represent an upper limit rather than an absolute requirement.

5. Do not assume that an environmental impact statement is automatically required to develop a SAMP.

6. EPA's program for advance identification of disposal areas found at 40 CFR 230.80 can be integrated into a SAMP process.

7. In accordance with this guidance, district engineers are encouraged to participate in development of SAMP's. However, since development of a SAMP can require a considerable investment of time, resources, and money, the SAMP process should be entered only if it is likely to result in a definitive regulatory product as defined in paragraph 4. above.

8. This guidance expires 31 December 1988 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Chief of Engineers:

Peter J. Offringa,

Brigadier General, USA, Deputy Director of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL-92-4)

RGL 92-4 DATE: 14 Sep 1992 EXPIRES: 21 Jan 1997

SUBJECT: Section 401 Water Quality Certification and Coastal Zone Management Act Conditions for Nationwide Permits

1. The purpose of this Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) is to provide additional guidance and clarification for divisions and districts involved in developing acceptable conditions under the Section 401 Water Quality Certifications and Coastal Zone Management Act (CZM) concurrences for the Nationwide Permit (NWP) Program. This RGL represents a clarification of 330.4(c) (2) and (3) and 330.4(d) (2) and (3), concerning when NWP Section 401 and CZM conditions should not be accepted and thus treated as a denial without prejudice. The principles contained in this RGL also apply to 401 certification and CZM concurrence conditions associated with individual permits and regional general permits.

2. Corps divisions and districts should work closely and cooperatively with the States to develop reasonable 401 and CZM conditions. All involved parties should participate in achieving the purpose of the NWP program, which is to provide the public with an expeditious permitting process while, at the same time, safeguarding the environment by only authorizing activities which result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects. When a State certifying agency or CZM agency proposes conditions, the division engineer is responsible for determining whether 401 Water Quality Certification or CZM concurrence conditions are acceptable and comply with the provisions of 33 CFR 325.4. In most cases it is expected that the conditions will be acceptable and the division engineer shall recognize these conditions as regional conditions of the NWP's.

3. *Unacceptable Conditions:* There will be cases when certain conditions will clearly be unacceptable and those conditioned 401 certifications or CZM concurrences shall be considered administratively denied. Consequently, authorization for an activity which meets the terms and conditions of such NWP(s) is denied without prejudice.

a. Illegal conditions are clearly unacceptable. Illegal conditions would result in violation of a law or regulation, or would require an illegal action. For example, a condition which would require an applicant to obtain a 401 certification or CZM concurrence, where the State has previously denied certification or concurrence, prior to submitting a pre-discharge notification (PDN) to the Corps in accordance with PDN procedures, would violate the Corps regulation at 33 CFR 330.4(c)(6). Another example would be a case where an applicant would be required, through a condition, to apply for an individual Department of the Army permit. Another example is a requirement by the State agency to utilize the 1989 Federal Wetland Delineation Manual to establish jurisdiction.

b. As a general rule, a condition that would require the Corps or another Federal agency to take an action which we would not otherwise take and do not choose to take, would be clearly unacceptable. For example, where the certification or concurrence is conditioned to require a PDN, where the proposed activity did not previously require a PDN, the Corps should not accept that condition, since implicitly the Corps would

have to accept and utilize the PDN. Another example would be a situation where the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is required, through a condition, to provide any type of formal review or approval.

c. Section 401 or CZM conditions which provide for limits (quantities, dimensions, etc.) different from those imposed by the NWP do not change the NWP limits.

1. Higher limits are clearly not acceptable. For example, increasing NWP 18 for minor discharges from 10 to 50 cubic yards would not be acceptable. Such conditions would confuse the regulated public and could contribute to violations.

2. Lower limits are acceptable but have the effect of denial without prejudice of those activities that are higher than the Section 401 or CZM condition limit but within the NWP limit. Thus, if an applicant obtains an individual 401 water quality certification and/or CZM concurrence for work within the limits of an NWP where the State had denied certification and/or CZM concurrence, then the activity could be authorized by the NWP.

d. A condition which would delete, modify, or reduce NWP conditions would be clearly unacceptable.

4. *Discretionary Enforcement:* The initiation of enforcement actions by the Corps, whether directed at unauthorized activities or to ensure compliance with permit conditions, is discretionary. The district engineer will consider the following situations when determining whether to enforce 401 and/or CZM conditions.

a. *Unenforceable Conditions*—Some conditions that a State may propose will not be reasonably enforceable by the Corps (e.g., a condition requiring compliance with the specific terms of another State permit). Provided such conditions do not violate paragraph 3 above, the conditions will be accepted by the Corps as regionally conditions. However, limited Corps resources should not be utilized in an attempt to enforce compliance with 401 or CZM conditions which the district engineer believes to be essentially unenforceable, or of low enforcement priority for limited Corps resources.

b. *Enforceable Conditions*—Some other conditions proposed by a State may be considered enforceable, (e.g., a condition requiring the applicant to obtain another State permit), but of low priority for Federal enforcement, since the Federal Government would not have required those conditions but for the State's requirement. Furthermore, the Corps will generally not enforce such State-imposed conditions except in very unusual cases, due to our limited personnel and financial resources.

5. *NWP Verification and PDN Responses:* In response to NWP verification requests and PDN's, district engineers should utilize the same paragraphs presented below. This language should be used where conditional 401 certification or CZM concurrence has been issued. This specifically addresses situations when the conditions included with the certification or concurrence are such that the district engineer determines they are unenforceable or the district engineer cannot clearly determine compliance with the 401/CZM conditions (see 4.a.).

"Based on our review of your proposal to [describe proposal], we have determined that the activity qualifies for the nationwide permit authorization [insert NWP No(s.)], subject to the terms and conditions of the permit.

[Insert paragraph on any Corps required activity-specific conditions].

Enclosed you will find a copy of the Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or Coastal Zone Management special conditions, which are conditions of your authorization under Nationwide Permit [insert NWP No(s.)]. If you have questions concerning compliance with the conditions of the 401 certification or Coastal Zone Management concurrence, you should contact the [insert appropriate State agency].

If you do not or cannot comply with these State Section 401 certification conditions and/or CZM conditions, then in order to be authorized by this Nationwide Permit, you must furnish this office with an individual 401 certification or Coastal Zone Management concurrence from [insert appropriate State agency], or a copy of the application to the State for such certification or concurrence, [insert "60 days" for Section 401 water quality certification, unless another reasonable period of time has been determined pursuant to 33 CFR 330.4(c)(6), or insert "six months" for CZM concurrence] after you submit it to the State agency."

6. This guidance expires 21 January 1997 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL 92-5)

RGL 92-5 Date: 29 October 1992, Expires: 31 December 1997

Subject: Alternatives Analysis Under the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines for Projects Subject to Modification Under the Clean Air Act.

1. Enclosed for implementation is a joint Army Corps of Engineers/Environmental Protection Agency Memorandum to the Field on alternatives analysis for existing power plants that must be modified to meet requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act. This guidance was developed jointly by the Corps and EPA.

2. This guidance expires 31 December 1997 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Encl

EPA/Corps Joint Memorandum for the Field

Subject: Alternatives Analysis under the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines for Projects Subject to Modification Under the Clean Air Act.

1. The 1990 Clean Air Act (CAA) amendments require most electric generating plants to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide in phases beginning in 1995 and requiring full compliance by 2010. The congressional

endorsement of the industry's ability to select the most effective compliance method (e.g., sulfur dioxide scrubbers, low sulfur coal, or other methods) recognizes the expertise of the industry in these cases and is a fundamental element in the CAA market-based pollution control program. Given the need for cooling water, a substantial number of electric power generating plants are located adjacent, or in close proximity, to waters of the United States, including wetlands. Depending on the method chosen by the plants to reduce emissions, we expect that these facilities will be applying for Clean Water Act Section 404 permits for certain proposed activities.

2. The analysis and regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of activities in waters of the United States conducted by specific power plants to comply with the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments must ensure protection of the aquatic environment consistent with the requirements of the Clean Water Act. The review of applications for such projects will fully consider, consistent with requirements under the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, all practicable alternatives including non-aquatic alternatives, for proposed discharges associated with the method selected by the utility to comply with the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. For the purposes of the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines analysis, the project purpose will be that pollutant reduction method selected by the permit applicant.

3. For example, a utility may have decided to install sulfur dioxide scrubbers on an existing power plant in order to meet the new 1990 Clean Air Act standards. The proposed construction of the scrubbers, treatment ponds and a barge unloading facility could impact wetlands. In this case, the Section 404 review would evaluate practicable alternative locations and configurations for the scrubbers, ponds and of the docking facilities. The analysis will also consider practicable alternatives which satisfy the project purpose (i.e., installing scrubbers) but which have a less adverse impact on the aquatic environment or do not involve discharges into waters of the United States. However, in order to best effectuate Congressional intent reflected in the CAA that electric utilities retain flexibility to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions in the most cost effective manner, the Section 404 review should not evaluate alternative methods of complying with the Clean Air Act standards not selected by the applicant (e.g., in this example use of low sulfur coal).

4. In evaluating the scope of practicable alternatives which satisfy the project purpose (e.g., constructing additional scrubber capacity), the alternatives analysis should not be influenced by the possibility that, based on a conclusion that practicable upland alternatives are available to the applicant, the project proponent may decide to pursue other options for meeting Clean Air Act requirements. Continuing the above example, a Corps determination that practicable upland alternatives are available for scrubber waste disposal should not be affected by the possibility that an applicant may subsequently decide to select a different method for meeting the Clean Air Act

standards (e.g., use of low sulfur coal that reduces waste generated by scrubbers).

5. The Corps and EPA will also recognize the tight time-frames under which the industry must meet these new air quality standards.

Robert H. Wayland,

Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds.

John P. Elmore,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL 93-1)

RGL 93-1 Issued: April 20, 1993, Expires: December 31, 1998

CECW-OR

Subject: Provisional Permits

1. *Purpose:* The purpose of this guidance is to establish a process that clarifies for applicants when the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has completed its evaluation and at what point the applicant should contact the State concerning the status of the Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or Coastal Zone Management (CZM) consistency concurrence. This process also allows for more accurate measurement of the total length of time spent by the Corps in evaluating permit applications (i.e., from receipt of a complete application until the Corps reaches a permit decision). For verification of authorization of activities under regional general permits, the Corps will use the appropriate nationwide permit procedures at 33 CFR 330.6.

2. *Background:* a. A Department of the Army permit involving a discharge of dredged or fill material cannot be issued until a State Section 401 Water Quality Certification has been issued or waived. Also, a Department of the Army permit cannot be issued for an activity within a State with a federally-approved Coastal Management Program when that activity that would occur within, or outside, a State's coastal zone will affect land or water uses or natural resources of the State's coastal zone, until the State concurs with the applicant's consistency determination, or concurrence is presumed. In many cases, the Corps completes its review before the State Section 401 Water Quality Certification or CZM concurrence requirements have been satisfied. In such cases, applicants and the public are often confused regarding who to deal with regarding resolution of any State issues.

b. The "provisional permit" procedures described below will facilitate a formal communication between the Corps and the applicant to clearly indicate that the applicant should be in contact with the appropriate State agencies to satisfy the State 401 Water Quality Certification or CZM concurrence requirements. In addition, the procedures will allow for a more accurate measurement of the Corps permit evaluation time.

3. *Provisional Permit Procedures:* The provisional permit procedures are optional and may only be used in those cases where: (i) The District Engineer (DE) has made a provisional individual permit decision that an individual permit should be issued, and,

(ii) the only action(s) preventing the issuance of that permit is that the State has not issued a required Section 401 Water Quality Certification (or waiver has not occurred) or the State has not concurred in the applicant's CZM consistency determination (or there is not a presumed concurrence). In such cases, the DE may, using these optional procedures, send a provisional permit to the applicant.

a. First, the DE will prepare and sign the provisional permit decision document. Then the provisional permit will be sent to the applicant by transmittal letter. (The sample transmittal letter at enclosure 1 contains the minimum information that must be provided.)

b. Next, the applicant would obtain the Section 401 Water Quality Certification (or waiver) and/or CZM consistency concurrence (or presumed concurrence). Then the applicant would sign the provisional permit and return it to the DE along with the appropriate fee and the Section 401 Water Quality Certification (or proof of waiver) and/or the CZM consistency concurrence (or proof of presumed concurrence).

c. Finally, the Corps would attach any Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or CZM consistency concurrence to the provisional permit, then sign the provisional permit (which then becomes the issued final permit), and forward the permit to the applicant.

d. This is the same basic process as the normal standard permit transmittal process except that the applicant is sent an unsigned permit (i.e., a provisional permit) prior to obtaining the Section 401 Water Quality Certification (or waiver) and/or CZM consistency concurrence (or presumed concurrence). (See enclosure 2.) A permit can not be issued (i.e., signed by the Corps) until the Section 401 and CZM requirements are satisfied.

4. *Provisional Permit:* A provisional permit is a standard permit document with a cover sheet. The cover sheet must clearly indicate the following: that a provisional permit is enclosed, that the applicant must obtain the Section 401 Water Quality Certification or CZM concurrence from the State, that these documents must be sent to the Corps along with the provisional permit signed by the applicant, and that the Corps will issue the permit upon receipt of these materials. The issued permit is the provisional permit signed by the applicant and the Corps. The provisional permit must contain a statement indicating that the applicant is required to comply with the Section 401 Water Quality Certification, including any conditions, and/or the CZM consistency concurrence, including any conditions. At enclosure 3 is a sample cover sheet for the provisional permit.

5. *Provisional Permit Decision:* The DE may reach a final decision that a permit should be issued provided that the State issues a Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or a CZM concurrence. In order to reach such a decision the DE must complete the normal standard permit evaluation process, prepare and sign a decision document, and prepare a standard permit, including any conditions or mitigation (i.e., a provisional permit). The decision document must include a statement

that the DE has determined that the permit will be issued if the State issues a Section 401 Water Quality Certification or waiver and/or a CZM concurrence, or presumed concurrence. The standard permit will not contain a condition that requires or provides for the applicant to obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or CZM concurrence. Once the decision document is signed, the applicant has the right to a DA permit if the State issues a Section 401 Water Quality Certification or waiver and/or a CZM concurrence, or if concurrence is presumed. Once the decision document is signed, the permittee's right to proceed can only be changed by using the modification, suspension and revocation procedures of 33 CFR 325.7, unless the State denies the Section 401 Water Quality Certification or nonconcurs with the applicant's CZM consistency determination.

6. *Enforcement:* In some cases, applicants might proceed with the project upon receipt of the provisional permit. The provisional permit is not a valid permit. In such cases, the Corps has a discretionary enforcement action to consider and should proceed as the DE determines to be appropriate. This occurs on occasion during the standard permit transmittal process. Since the Corps is not changing the normal process of sending unsigned permits to the applicant for signature, there should not be an increase in the occurrence of such unauthorized activities.

7. *Modification:* a. In most cases the Section 401 Water Quality Certification, including conditions, and/or CZM consistency concurrence, including conditions, will be consistent with the provisional permit. In such cases, the DE will simply sign the final permit and enclose the 401 water quality certification and/or CZM consistency concurrence with the final permit (i.e., the signed provisional permit).

b. In a few cases such State approval may necessitate modifications to the Corps preliminary permit decision. Such modifications will be processed in accordance with 33 CFR 325.7.

(1) When the modifications are minor and the DE agrees to such modifications, then a supplement to the provisional decision document may be prepared, as appropriate, and the permit issued with such modifications. (This should usually be done by enclosing the State 401 Water Quality Certification and/or CZM consistency concurrence to the permit, but in a few cases may require a revision to the permit document itself.)

(2) When the modification results in substantial change or measurable increase in adverse impacts or the Corps does not initially agree with the change, then the modification will be processed and counted as a separate permit action for reporting purposes. This may require a new public notice or additional coordination with appropriate Federal and/or state agencies. The provisional decision document will be supplemented or may be completely rewritten, as necessary.

8. *Denial:* If the State denies the Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or the State nonconcurs with the applicant's CZM

consistency determination, then the Corps permit is denied without prejudice.

9. This guidance expires 31 December 1998 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

3 Encls

Sample Provisional Permit Transmittal Letter

Dear _____: We have completed our review of your permit application identified as [File No., appl. name, etc.] for the following proposed work:

near/in/at _____.

Enclosed is a "PROVISIONAL PERMIT." The provisional permit is NOT VALID and does not authorize you to do your work. The provisional permit describes the work that will be authorized, and the General and Special Conditions [if any] which will be placed on your final Department of the Army (DA) permit, if the State of

_____ Water Quality Certification and/or Coastal Zone Management (CZM) consistency requirements are satisfied as described below. No work is to be performed in the waterway or adjacent wetlands until you have received a validated copy of the DA permit.

By Federal law no DA permit can be issued until a State Section 401 Water Quality Certification has been issued or has been waived and/or the State has concurred with a permit applicant's CZM consistency determination or concurrence has been presumed. As of this date the [State 401 certification agency] has not issued a Section 401 Water Quality Certification for your proposed work. If the [State 401 certification agency] fails or refuses to act by [date 401 certification must be issued] the Section 401 Water Quality Certification requirement will be automatically waived. Also, as of this date the [State CZM agency] has not concurred with your CZM consistency determination. If the State does not act by [six months from receipt by the State of the applicant's CZM consistency determination] then concurrence with your CZM consistency determination will automatically be presumed.

Conditions of the State Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or the State CZM concurrence will become conditions to the final DA permit. Should the State's action on the required certification or concurrence preclude validation of the provisional permit in its current form, a modification to the provisional permit will be evaluated and you will be notified as appropriate. Substantial changes may require a new permit evaluation process, including issuing a new public notice.

Enclosure 1

Final Permit Actions

Normal Permit Process

1. Corps completes permit decision, and state 401/CZM issued/waived
2. Corps sends unsigned permit to applicant
3. Applicant signs permit and returns with fee
4. Corps signs permit

Draft Permit Process

1. Corps completes permit decision, but state 401/CZM not complete
2. Corps sends draft permit to applicant
3. State 401/CZM issued/waived
4. Applicant signs permit and returns with fee and 401/CZM action
5. Corps reviews 401/CZM action and signs permit

1. The signed draft permit with the attached 401/CZM action is to be treated as the applicant's request for a permit subject to any 401/CZM certification/concurrence including any conditions.

2. If the 401/CZM action results in a modification to the draft permit, then step 4. would be treated as a request for such modification and if we agree with the modification, then the permit would be issued with the modification and the decision document supplemented, as appropriate. If the Corps does not initially agree with the modification, or it involves a substantial change or measurable increase in adverse impacts, then the modification would be processed as a separate permit action for reporting purposes.

Enclosure 2

Once the State has issued the required Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or concurred with your CZM consistency determination or the dates above have passed without the State acting, and you agree to the terms and conditions of the provisional permit, you should sign and date both copies and return them to us [along with your \$100.00/\$10.00 permit fee]. Your DA permit will not be valid until we have returned a copy to you bearing both your signature and the signature of the appropriate Corps official.

If the State denies the required Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or nonconcurs with your CZM consistency determination, then the DA permit is denied without prejudice. If you should subsequently obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or a CZM consistency determination concurrence, you should contact this office to determine how to proceed with your permit application.

If you have any questions concerning your State Section 401 Water Quality Certification, please contact (State 401 certification contact)

If you have any questions concerning the CZM consistency determination, please contact (State CZM contact)

If you have any other questions concerning your application for a DA permit, please contact [Corps contact] at [Corps contact telephone number].

Provisional Permit—Not Valid—Do Not Begin Work

This PROVISIONAL PERMIT is NOT VALID until:

(1) You obtain: _____ a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from State Agency). _____ a Coastal Zone Consistency determination concurrence from (State Agency).

(2) You sign and return the enclosed provisional permit with the State Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or CZM concurrence and the appropriate permit fee as indicated below:
_____ \$10.00 _____ \$100.00 _____ No fee required.

(3) The Corps signs the permit and returns it to you. Your permit is denied without prejudice, if the State denies your Section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or nonconcurs with your Coastal Zone Management consistency determination.

Do Not Begin Work

Regulatory Guidance Letter, (RGL 93-2)

RGL 93-2 Date: 23 August 1993, Expires: 31 December 1998

Subject: Guidance on Flexibility of the 404(b)(1) Guidelines and Mitigation Banking.

1. Enclosed are two guidance documents signed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) and the Environmental Protection Agency. The first document provides guidance on the flexibility that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be utilizing when making determinations of compliance with the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, particularly with regard to the alternatives analysis. The second document provides guidance on the use of mitigation banks as a means of providing compensatory mitigation for Corps regulatory decisions.

2. Both enclosed guidance documents should be implemented immediately. These guidance documents constitute an important aspect of the President's plan for protecting the Nation's wetlands, "Protecting America's Wetlands: A Fair, Flexible and Effective Approach" (published on 24 August 1993).

3. This guidance expires 31 December 1998 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

2 Encls

Memorandum to the Field

Subject: Appropriate Level of Analysis Required for Evaluating Compliance With the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines Alternatives Requirements

1. *Purpose:* The purpose of this memorandum is to clarify the appropriate level of analysis required for evaluating compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines' (Guidelines) requirements for consideration of alternatives. 40 CFR 230.10(a). Specifically, this memorandum describes the flexibility afforded by the Guidelines to make

regulatory decisions based on the relative severity of the environmental impact of proposed discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States.

2. *Background:* The Guidelines are the substantive environmental standards by which all Section 404 permit applications are evaluated. The Guidelines, which are binding regulations, were published by the Environmental Protection Agency at 40 CFR Part 230 on December 24, 1980. The fundamental precept of the Guidelines is that discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands, should not occur unless it can be demonstrated that such discharges, either individually or cumulatively, will not result in unacceptable adverse effects on the aquatic ecosystem. The Guidelines specifically require that "no discharge of dredged or fill material shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences." 40 CFR 230.10(a). Based on this provision, the applicant is required in every case (irrespective of whether the discharge site is a special aquatic site or whether the activity associated with the discharge is water dependent) to evaluate opportunities for use of non-aquatic areas and other aquatic sites that would result in less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem. A permit cannot be issued, therefore, in circumstances where a less environmentally damaging practicable alternative for the proposed discharge exists (except as provided for under Section 404(b)(2)).

3. *Discussion:* The Guidelines are, as noted above, binding regulations. It is important to recognize, however, that this regulatory status does not limit the inherent flexibility provided in the Guidelines for implementing these provisions. The preamble to the Guidelines is very clear in this regard:

Of course, as the regulation itself makes clear, a certain amount of flexibility is still intended. For example, while the ultimate conditions of compliance are "regulatory", the Guidelines allow some room for judgment in determining what must be done to arrive at a conclusion that those conditions have or have not been met.

Guidelines Preamble, "Regulation versus Guidelines", 45 *Federal Register* 85336 (December 24, 1980).

Notwithstanding this flexibility, the record must contain sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed discharge complies with the requirements of Section 230.10(a) of the Guidelines. The amount of information needed to make such a determination and the level of scrutiny required by the Guidelines is commensurate with the severity of the environmental impact (as determined by the functions of the aquatic resource and the nature of the proposed activity) and the scope/cost of the project.

a. Analysis Associated With Minor Impacts

The Guidelines do not contemplate that the same intensity of analysis will be required for all types of projects but instead envision a

correlation between the scope of the evaluation and the potential extent of adverse impacts on the aquatic environment. The introduction to Section 230.10(a) recognizes that the level of analysis required may vary with the nature and complexity of each individual case:

Although all requirements in § 230.10 must be met, the compliance evaluation procedures will vary to reflect the seriousness of the potential for adverse impacts on the aquatic ecosystems posed by specific dredged or fill material discharge activities.

40 CFR 230.10

Similarly, Section 230.6 ("Adaptability") makes clear that the Guidelines allow evaluation and documentation for a variety of activities, ranging from those with large, complex impacts on the aquatic environment to those for which the impact is likely to be innocuous. It is unlikely that the Guidelines will apply in their entirety to any one activity, no matter how complex. It is anticipated that substantial numbers of permit applications will be for minor, routine activities that have little, if any, potential for significant degradation of the aquatic environment. *It generally is not intended or expected that extensive testing, evaluation or analysis will be needed to make findings of compliance in such routine cases.*

40 CFR 230.6(9) (emphasis added)

Section 230.6 also emphasizes that when making determinations of compliance with the Guidelines, users must recognize the different levels of effort that should be associated with varying degrees of impact and require or prepare commensurate documentation. *The level of documentation should reflect the significance and complexity of the discharge activity.*

40 CFR 230.6(b) (emphasis added)

Consequently, the Guidelines clearly afford flexibility to adjust the stringency of the alternatives review for projects that would have only minor impacts. Minor impacts are associated with activities that generally would have little potential to degrade the aquatic environment and include one, and frequently more, of the following characteristics: Are located in aquatic resources of limited natural function; are small in size and cause little direct impact; have little potential for secondary or cumulative impacts; or cause only temporary impacts. It is important to recognize, however, that in some circumstances even small or temporary fills result in substantial impacts, and that in such cases a more detailed evaluation is necessary. The Corps Districts and EPA Regions will, through the standard permit evaluation process, coordinate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service and other appropriate state and Federal agencies in evaluating the likelihood that adverse impacts would result from a particular proposal. It is not appropriate to consider compensatory mitigation in determining whether a proposed discharge will cause only minor impacts for purposes of the alternatives analysis required by Section 230.10(a).

In reviewing projects that have the potential for only minor impacts on the

aquatic environment, Corps and EPA field offices are directed to consider, in coordination with state and Federal resource agencies, the following factors:

(i) Such projects by their nature should not cause or contribute to significant degradation individually or cumulatively. Therefore, it generally should not be necessary to conduct or require detailed analyses to determine compliance with Section 230.10(c).

(ii) Although sufficient information must be developed to determine whether the proposed activity is in fact the least damaging practicable alternative, the Guidelines do not require an elaborate search for practicable alternatives if it is reasonably anticipated that there are only minor differences between the environmental impacts of the proposed activity and potentially practicable alternatives. This decision will be made after consideration of resource agency comments on the proposed project. It often makes sense to examine first whether potential alternatives would result in no identifiable or discernible difference in impact on the aquatic ecosystem. Those alternatives that do not may be eliminated from the analysis since Section 230.10(a) of the Guidelines only prohibits discharges when a practicable alternative exists which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem. Because evaluating practicability is generally the more difficult aspect of the alternatives analysis, this approach should save time and effort for both the applicant and the regulatory agencies.¹ By initially focusing the alternatives analysis on the question of impacts on the aquatic ecosystem, it may be possible to limit (or in some instances eliminate altogether) the number of alternatives that have to be evaluated for practicability.

(iii) When it is determined that there is no identifiable or discernible difference in adverse impact on the environment between the applicant's proposed alternative and all other practicable alternatives, then the applicant's alternative is considered as satisfying the requirements of 40 CFR 230. (a).

(iv) Even where a practicable alternative exists that would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, the Guidelines allow it to be rejected if it would have "other significant adverse environmental consequences." 40 CFR 230.10(a). As explained in the preamble, this allows for consideration of "evidence of damages to other ecosystems in deciding whether there is a 'better' alternative." Hence, in applying the alternatives analysis required by the Guidelines, it is not appropriate to select an alternative where minor impacts on the aquatic environment are avoided at the cost of substantial impacts to other natural environmental values.

(v) In cases of negligible or trivial impacts (e.g., small discharges to construct individual driveways), it may be possible to conclude that no alternative location could result in

¹ In certain instances, however, it may be easier to examine practicability first. Some projects may be so site-specific (e.g., erosion control, bridge replacement) that no off site alternative could be practicable. In such cases the alternatives analysis may appropriately be limited to onsite options only.

less adverse impact on the aquatic environment within the meaning of the Guidelines. In such cases, it may not be necessary to conduct an offsite alternatives analysis but instead require only any practicable onsite minimization.

This guidance concerns application of the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines to projects with minor impacts. Projects which may cause more than minor impacts on the aquatic environment, either individually or cumulatively, should be subjected to a proportionately more detailed level of analysis to determine compliance or noncompliance with the Guidelines. Projects which cause substantial impacts, in particular, must be thoroughly evaluated through the standard permit evaluation process to determine compliance with all provisions of the Guidelines.

b. Relationship Between the Scope of Analysis and the Scope/Cost of the Proposed Project

The Guidelines provide the Corps and EPA with discretion for determining the necessary level of analysis to support a conclusion as to whether or not an alternative is practicable. Practicable alternatives are those alternatives that are "available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes." 40 CFR 230.10(a)(2). The preamble to the Guidelines provides clarification on how cost is to be considered in the determination of practicability:

Our intent is to consider those alternatives which are *reasonable in terms of the overall scope/cost of the proposed project*. The term economic [for which the term "cost" was substituted in the final rule] might be construed to include consideration of the applicant's financial standing, or investment, or market share, a cumbersome inquiry which is not necessarily material to the objectives of the Guidelines.

Guidelines Preamble, "Alternatives", 45 FR 85339 (December 24, 1980) (emphasis added).

Therefore, the level of analysis required for determining which alternatives are practicable will vary depending on the type of project proposed. The determination of what constitutes an unreasonable expense should generally consider whether the project cost is substantially greater than the costs normally associated with the particular type of project. Generally, as the scope/cost of the project increases, the level of analysis should also increase. To the extent the Corps obtains information on the costs associated with the project, such information may be considered when making a determination of what constitutes an unreasonable expense.

The preamble to the Guidelines also states that "[i]f an alleged alternative is unreasonably expensive to the applicant, the alternative is not 'practicable.'" Guidelines Preamble, "Economic Factors", 45 FR 85343 (December 24, 1980). Therefore, to the extent that individual homeowners and small businesses may typically be associated with small projects with minor impacts, the nature of the applicant may also be a relevant consideration in determining what

constitutes a practicable alternative. It is important to emphasize, however, that it is not a particular applicant's financial standing that is the primary consideration for determining practicability, but rather characteristics of the project and what constitutes a reasonable expense for these projects that are most relevant to practicability determinations.

4. The burden of proof to demonstrate compliance with the Guidelines rests with the applicant; where insufficient information is provided to determine compliance, the Guidelines require that no permit be issued. 40 CFR 230.12(a)(3)(iv).

5. A reasonable, common sense approach in applying the requirements of the Guidelines' alternatives analysis is fully consistent with sound environmental protection. The Guidelines clearly contemplate that reasonable discretion should be applied based on the nature of the aquatic resources and potential impacts of a proposed activity in determining compliance with the alternatives test. Such an approach encourages effective decisionmaking and fosters a better understanding and enhanced confidence in the Section 404 program.

6. This guidance is consistent with the February 6, 1990 "Memorandum of Agreement Between the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Army Concerning the Determination of Mitigation under the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines."

Signed 8-23-93

Robert H. Wayland, III,

Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Signed 8-23-93

Michael L. Davis,

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army.

Memorandum to the Field

Subject: Establishment and Use of Wetland Mitigation Banks in the Clean Water Act Section 404 Regulatory Program

1. This memorandum provides general guidelines for the establishment and use of wetland mitigation banks in the Clean Water Act Section 404 regulatory program. This memorandum serves as interim guidance pending completion of Phase I by the Corps of Engineers' Institute for Water Resources study on wetland mitigation banking,² at which time this guidance will be reviewed and any appropriate revisions will be incorporated into final guidelines.

2. For purposes of this guidance, wetland mitigation banking refers to the restoration, creation, enhancement, and, in exceptional circumstances, preservation of wetlands or other aquatic habitats expressly for the

purpose of providing compensatory mitigation in advance of discharges into wetlands permitted under the Section 404 regulatory program. Wetland mitigation banks can have several advantages over individual mitigation projects, some of which are listed below:

(a) Compensatory mitigation can be implemented and functioning in advance of project impacts, thereby reducing temporal losses of wetland functions and uncertainty over whether the mitigation will be successful in offsetting wetland losses.

(b) It may be more ecologically advantageous for maintaining the integrity of the aquatic ecosystem to consolidate compensatory mitigation for impacts to many smaller, isolated or fragmented habitats into a single large parcel or contiguous parcels.

(c) Development of a wetland mitigation bank can bring together financial resources and planning and scientific expertise not practicable to many individual mitigation proposals. This consolidation of resources can increase the potential for the establishment and long-term management of successful mitigation.

(d) Wetland mitigation banking proposals may reduce regulatory uncertainty and provide more cost-effective compensatory mitigation opportunities.

3. The Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (Guidelines), as clarified by the "Memorandum of Agreement Concerning the Determination of Mitigation under the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines" (Mitigation MOA) signed February 6, 1990, by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Army, establish a mitigation sequence that is used in the evaluation of individual permit applications. Under this sequence, all appropriate and practicable steps must be undertaken by the applicant to first avoid and then minimize adverse impacts to the aquatic ecosystem. Remaining unavoidable impacts must then be offset through compensatory mitigation to the extent appropriate and practicable. Requirements for compensatory mitigation may be satisfied through the use of wetland mitigation banks, so long as their use is consistent with standard practices for evaluating compensatory mitigation proposals outlined in the Mitigation MOA. It is important to emphasize that, given the mitigation sequence requirements described above, permit applicants should not anticipate that the establishment of, or participation in, a wetland mitigation bank will ultimately lead to a determination of compliance with the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines without adequate demonstration that impacts associated with the proposed discharge have been avoided and minimized to the extent practicable.

4. The agencies' preference for on-site, in-kind compensatory mitigation does not preclude the use of wetland mitigation banks where it has been determined by the Corps, or other appropriate permitting agency, in coordination with the Federal resource agencies through the standard permit evaluation process, that the use of a particular mitigation bank as compensation for proposed wetland impacts would be appropriate for offsetting impacts to the

²The Corps of Engineers Institute for Water Resources, under the authority of Section 307(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, is undertaking a comprehensive two-year review and evaluation of wetland mitigation banking to assist in the development of a national policy on this issue. The interim summary report documenting the results of the first phase of the study is scheduled for completion in the fall of 1993.

aquatic ecosystem. In making such a determination, careful consideration must be given to wetland functions, landscape position, and affected species populations at both the impact and mitigation bank sites. In addition, compensation for wetland impacts should occur, where appropriate and practicable, within the same watershed as the impact site. Where a mitigation bank is being developed in conjunction with a wetland resource planning initiative (e.g., Special Area Management Plan, State Wetland Conservation Plan) to satisfy particular wetland restoration objectives, the permitting agency will determine, in coordination with the Federal resource agencies, whether use of the bank should be considered an appropriate form of compensatory mitigation for impacts occurring within the same watershed.

5. Wetland mitigation banks should generally be in place and functional before credits may be used to offset permitted wetland losses. However, it may be appropriate to allow incremental distribution of credits corresponding to the appropriate stage of successful establishment of wetland functions. Moreover, variable mitigation ratios (credit acreage to impacted wetland acreage) may be used in such circumstances to reflect the wetland functions attained at a bank site at a particular point in time. For example, higher ratios would be required when a bank is not yet fully functional at the time credits are to be withdrawn.

6. Establishment of each mitigation bank should be accompanied by the development of a formal written agreement (e.g., memorandum of agreement) among the Corps, EPA, other relevant resource agencies, and those parties who will own, develop, operate or otherwise participate in the bank. The purpose of the agreement is to establish clear guidelines for establishment and use of the mitigation bank. A wetlands mitigation bank may also be established through issuance of a Section 404 permit where establishing the proposed bank involves a discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. The banking agreement or, where applicable, special conditions of the permit establishing the bank should address the following considerations, where appropriate:

- (a) location of the mitigation bank;
- (b) goals and objectives for the mitigation bank project;
- (c) identification of bank sponsors and participants;
- (d) development and maintenance plan;
- (e) evaluation methodology acceptable to all signatories to establish bank credits and assess bank success in meeting the project goals and objectives;
- (f) specific accounting procedures for tracking crediting and debiting;
- (g) geographic area of applicability;
- (h) monitoring requirements and responsibilities;
- (i) remedial action responsibilities including funding; and
- (j) provisions for protecting the mitigation bank in perpetuity.

Agency participation in a wetlands mitigation banking agreement may not, in any way, restrict or limit the authorities and responsibilities of the agencies.

7. An appropriate methodology, acceptable to all signatories, should be identified and used to evaluate the success of wetland restoration and creation efforts within the mitigation bank and to identify the appropriate stage of development for issuing mitigation credits. A full range of wetland functions should be assessed. Functional evaluations of the mitigation bank should generally be conducted by a multi-disciplinary team representing involved resource and regulatory agencies and other appropriate parties. The same methodology should be used to determine the functions and values of both credits and debits. As an alternative, credits and debits can be based on acres of various types of wetlands (e.g., National Wetland Inventory classes). Final determinations regarding debits and credits will be made by the Corps, or other appropriate permitting agency, in consultation with Federal resource agencies.

8. Permit applicants may draw upon the available credits of a third party mitigation bank (i.e., a bank developed and operated by an entity other than the permit applicant). The Section 404 permit, however, must state explicitly that the permittee remains responsible for ensuring that the mitigation requirements are satisfied.

9. To ensure legal enforceability of the mitigation conditions, use of mitigation conditions, use of mitigation bank credits must be conditioned in the Section 404 permit by referencing the banking agreement or Section 404 permit establishing the bank; however, such a provision should not limit the responsibility of the Section 404 permittee for satisfying all legal requirements of the permit.

signed 8-23-93

Robert H. Wayland, III,

Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

signed 8-23-93

Michael L. Davis,

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army.

Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL 93-3)

RGL 93-3 Issued: September 13, 1993

Expires: not applicable.

Subject: Rescission of Regulatory Guidance Letters (RGL) 90-5, 90-7, and 90-8

1. On 25 August 1993 the final "Excavation Rule" was published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 45008) and becomes effective on 24 September 1993. This regulation modifies the definition of "Discharge of Dredged Material" to address landclearing activities (see 33 CFR 232.2(d)); modifies the definitions of "Fill Material" and "Discharge of Fill Material" to address the placement of pilings (see 33 CFR 323.2 (e) and (f) and 323.3(c)); and modifies the definition of "waters of the United States" to address prior converted cropland (see 33 CFR 328.(a)(8)).

2. Therefore, RGL 90-5, Subject: "Landclearing Activities Subject to Section 404 Jurisdiction"; RGL 90-7, Subject: "Clarification of the Phrase 'Normal Circumstances' as it pertains to Cropped Wetlands"; and RGL 90-8, Subject: "Applicability of Section 404 to Pilings"; are

hereby rescinded effective 24 September 1993. Furthermore, although RGL 90-5, Subject: "Landclearing Activities Subject to Section 404 Jurisdiction" expired on 31 December 1992 it should continue to be applied until 24 September 1993.

3. In addition, RGL's 90-5, 90-7, and 90-8 as of 24 September 1993 will no longer be used for guidance since the guidance contained in those RGL's has been superseded by the regulation.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter, RGL 94-1

Date: 23 May 1994, Expires: 31 December 1999

Subject: Expiration of Geographic Jurisdictional Determinations.

1. Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) 90-6, Subject: "Expiration Dates for Wetlands Jurisdictional Delineations" is extended until 31 December 1999, subject to the following revisions.

2. This guidance should be applied to all jurisdictional determinations for all waters of the United States made pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and Section 103 of the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.

3. To be consistent with paragraph IV.A. of the 6 January 1994, interagency Memorandum of Agreement Concerning the Delineation of Wetlands for Purposes of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Subtitle B of the Food Security Act, all U.S. Army Corps of Engineers geographic jurisdictional determinations shall be in writing and normally remain valid for a period of five years. The Corps letter (see paragraph 4.(d) of RGL 90-6) should include a statement that the jurisdictional determination is valid for a period of five years from the date of the letter unless new information warrants revision of the determination before the expiration date.

4. For wetland jurisdictional delineations the "effective date of this RGL" referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5 of RGL 90-6 was and remains 14 August 1990. For jurisdictional determinations, other than wetlands jurisdictional delineations, the "effective date of this RGL" referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5 of RGL 90-6 will be the date of this RGL.

5. Previous Corps written jurisdictional determinations, including wetland jurisdictional delineations, with a validity period of three years remain valid for the stated period of three years. The district engineer is not required to issue new letters to extend such period from three years to a total of five years. However, if requested to do so, the district engineer will normally extend the three year period to a total of five years unless new information warrants a new jurisdictional determination.

6. Districts are not required to issue a public notice on this guidance but may do so at their discretion.

7. This guidance expires on 31 December 1999 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Regulatory Guidance Letter, RGL 94-2

Date: 17 August 1994, Expires: 31 Dec 1999
CECW-OR

Subject: Superfund Projects

1. Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) 85-07, subject: "Superfund Projects" is hereby reissued (copy enclosed).

2. This RGL was previously extended by RGL 89-2. Although the extension expired, RGL 85-07 has continued to be U.S. Army Corps of Engineers policy.

3. This guidance expires 31 December 1999 unless sooner revised or rescinded.

For the Director of Civil Works:

John P. Elmore, P.E.,

Chief, Operations, Construction and Readiness Division, Directorate of Civil Works.

Encl

RGL 85-7, Dated 5 July 1985, Expires 31 Dec 1987

Subject: Superfund Projects

1. Recently, the Chief Counsel, Mr. Lester Edelman, responded to a letter from Mr. William N. Hedeman, Jr., Director, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) which dealt with the need for Department of Army authorizations for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) actions. This letter summarizes Mr. Edelman's opinion and provides operating guidance for field interaction with the EPA.

2. EPA's basic position is that Congress did not intend for CERCLA response actions to be subject to other environmental laws. Rather, as a matter of sound practice, CERCLA response actions generally should meet the standards established by those laws. Consequently, it is the EPA's position that neither it nor the states, in pursuing response actions at the location of the release or threatened release under the authority of CERCLA, are required to obtain permits under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act for those actions.

3. Mr. Edelman stated in part that he has some reservations about the position that the EPA has taken. Nevertheless, he recognizes that the EPA has the primary authority for the interpretation and application of CERCLA, and therefore would defer to the EPA's reading of its own statutory authorities, at least for the time being.

4. In light of this legal opinion, FOAs should not require applications for the EPA or state response actions at the location of the release or threatened release pursued under the authority of CERCLA. Any permit applications in process should be terminated.

5. Both the EPA and OCE believe that the FOAs' expertise in assessing the public interest factors for dredging and filling operations can contribute to the overall quality of the CERCLA response action. The Director of Civil Works will be establishing

a group from his staff to work with the EPA staff to develop a framework for integrating the Corps Sections 10, Section 404 and, if appropriate, Section 103 concerns into the EPA's substantive Superfund reviews.

6. Until specific guidance is provided from OCE, FOAs should provide technical support to the EPA regions and/or the states on matters within their field of expertise.

For the Chief of Engineers:

C.E. Edgar III

[FR Doc. 95-6253 Filed 3-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Indian Education National Advisory Council; Meeting

AGENCY: National Advisory Council on Indian Education, Education.

ACTION: Notice of hearing.

SUMMARY: The National Advisory Council on Indian Education invites the public to attend a one-day hearing conducted by the Council. This notice also describes the functions of the Council. Notice of this meeting is required under section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

DATES AND TIMES: Sunday, March 19, 1995 from 9:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The hearing will be held at the Quality Hotel Capitol Hill in the Sky Suite, 415 New Jersey Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20001, (202) 638-1616, Fax (202) 638-0707.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John W. Cheek, Acting Director, National Advisory Council on Indian Education, 330 C Street, S.W., Room 4072, Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202-7556. Telephone: 202/205-8353.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Advisory Council on Indian Education is established under section 5342 of the Indian Education Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2642). The Council is established to, among other things, assist the Secretary of Education in carrying out responsibilities under the Indian Education Act of 1988 (Part C, Title V, Pub. L. 100-297) and to advise Congress and the Secretary of Education with regard to federal education programs in which Indian children or adults participate or from which they can benefit.

The National Advisory Council on Indian Education is scheduling a one-day hearing on Sunday, March 19, 1995, prior to the National American Indian and Alaska Native Education Summit being planned for March 20-22, 1995. The hearing will allow participants the opportunity to present written and/or oral testimony on any of the topic areas

being addressed by the national summit or any other area of concern related to Indian education. The five key issues areas to be addressed during the summit include: Tribal Sovereignty/Trust Responsibility; Education Policy Development; the Impact of Goals 2000, A Tribal Perspective; Native Language and Culture; and the Federal Budget. Any submitted testimony and address one of the previously mentioned topic areas and follow this format: Statement of the problem; statement of desired remedy or solution; argument on behalf of desired remedy; and identification of who needs to do what and who oversees its follow through. Other testimony from topic areas not specifically addressed by the summit are also welcome. Findings from the hearing will be incorporated into the overall summit agenda. Participants wishing to present written and/or oral testimony are requested to submit any documentation to the staff of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education prior to the hearing if possible and no later than 5:00 p.m. on the day of the hearing. Testimony may also be faxed to the NACIE office at (202) 205-9446 any time prior to the hearing date. Oral testimony will be scheduled according to topic areas and announced the morning of the hearing or from the NACIE office the week prior to the summit.

Records are kept of all Council proceedings, and are available for public inspection at the office of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education located at 330 C Street S.W., Room 4072, Washington, DC 20202-7556 from the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

John W. Cheek,

Acting Director, National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

[FR Doc. 95-6278 Filed 3-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-M

National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board; Meeting

AGENCY: National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, Education.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of the inaugural meeting of the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board. This notice also describes the functions of the Board. Notice of this meeting is required under Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and is intended to notify the public of their opportunity to attend.