

**PROTECTING AMERICA'S WETLANDS:  
A FAIR, FLEXIBLE, AND EFFECTIVE APPROACH**

**WHITE HOUSE OFFICE ON ENVIRONMENTAL  
POLICY**

**August 24th, 1993**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. Introduction
- II. A Divisive Debate
- III. The Interagency Working Group on Federal Wetlands Policy
- IV. Five Principles for Federal Wetlands Policy
- V. A Comprehensive Package of Reforms
  - A. Addressing Landowner Concerns
  - B. Advance Planning and Watershed Management
  - C. Agriculture
  - D. Categorization
  - E. Geographic Jurisdiction
  - F. Mitigation and Mitigation Banking
  - G. Restoration
  - H. Roles of Federal Agencies
  - I. Roles of State, Tribal, and Local Government
  - J. Scope of Regulated Activities
  - K. State of Alaska
  - L. Takings
- VI. Conclusion
- VII. Postscript: Lessons From the Flood

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The Clinton Administration is proposing a comprehensive package of improvements to the Federal wetlands program that reflects a new broad-based consensus among Federal agencies. For years, many have argued that the Federal government badly needed to

improve its wetlands program to make it fairer and more effective. But for too long, contradictory policies from feuding Federal agencies have blocked progress, creating uncertainty and confusion. This wetlands package reflects a sharp break through the past gridlock caused by warring Federal agencies and contains a balanced, common sense, workable set of improvements that will make the program simpler, fairer, better coordinated with state and local efforts and more effective at protecting wetlands.

The Nation's wetlands perform many functions that are important to society, such as improving water quality, recharging groundwater, providing natural flood control, and supporting a wide variety of fish, wildlife and plants. The economic importance of wetlands to commercial fisheries and recreational uses is also enormous. The Nation has lost nearly half of the wetland acreage that existed in the lower 48 States prior to European settlement. The Nation's wetlands continue to be lost at a rate of hundreds of thousands of acres per year due to both human activity and natural processes. This continued loss occurs at great cost to society.

Notwithstanding the importance of wetland resources, efforts to protect wetlands have caused considerable controversy. It is estimated that 75 percent of the Nation's wetlands in the lower 48 States are located on private property. It is, therefore, imperative to recognize and consider fully the impacts of wetlands protection policies on individuals who own wetland property. Statutory, regulatory, and policy objectives should be accomplished in a manner that avoids unnecessary impacts upon such landowners.

Given the environmental and economic significance of wetlands, the alarming rate of wetlands loss, and concerns for private landowners, the Interagency Working Group on Federal Wetlands Policy began developing a comprehensive package of initiatives in June. The policy positions contained in this paper strongly support the effective protection and restoration of the Nation's wetlands, while advocating much-needed reforms to increase the fairness and flexibility of Federal regulatory programs.

## **II. A DIVISIVE DEBATE**

Federal programs to protect the Nation's wetlands have been the focus of considerable controversy in recent years. Much of the attention focused upon the 1989 Interagency Wetlands Delineation Manual (1989 Manual). The 1989 Manual was prepared jointly by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) of the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service (SCS). It was developed in response to criticism that Federal agencies were not using a single set of common procedures to "delineate" -- or identify -- wetlands under the jurisdiction of programs administered by these agencies.

But rather than alleviating concerns about inconsistency, the 1989 Manual only further fueled the controversy. Critics claimed that the 1989 Manual represented a major expansion of regulatory jurisdiction without opportunity for public participation. In response, the Bush Administration embarked upon a closed-door effort to revise the 1989

Manual. This process resulted in the technically flawed 1991 Manual that would have dramatically and indefensibly reduced the amount of wetlands subject to protection. The proposed 1991 Manual generated even further controversy and resulted in even greater polarization of the debate on Federal wetlands policy. In addition to assailing the 1989 Manual, critics of Federal wetlands regulatory programs effectively characterized those programs as unfair, inflexible, inconsistent, and confusing. Supporters of wetlands protection responded -- with equal effectiveness -- by emphasizing the environmental and economic benefits associated with protecting the Nation's wetlands.

As both sides voiced their strongly held opinions, the debate over Federal wetlands policy became increasingly divisive. The opposition that developed to both the 1989 and 1991 Manuals demonstrated the policy deadlock that had developed. Wetlands policy has become one of the most controversial environmental issues facing the Federal government, just as Congress embarks upon the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act.

### **III. THE INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP ON FEDERAL WETLANDS POLICY**

The Administration convened the Interagency Working Group on Federal Wetlands Policy in early June with the goal of developing a package of Clinton Administration initiatives to break the deadlock over Federal wetlands policy. The group has been chaired by the White House Office on Environmental Policy and has included the participation of the EPA, the Army (the Corps of Engineers), the Office of Management and Budget, and the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Energy, Interior, Justice, and Transportation.

The working group sought the views of a broad range of stakeholders representing all perspectives in the wetlands debate. For example, the working group has received presentations that have included: a bipartisan group of eight members of the U.S. Congress; representatives of State and local government; environmentalists; the development community; agricultural interests; scientists and others.

After listening to this broad range of interests, the working group began its policy deliberations by establishing the following five principles that serve as the framework for the Administration's comprehensive package of wetlands reform initiatives.

### **IV. FIVE PRINCIPLES FOR FEDERAL WETLANDS POLICY**

- 1) The Clinton Administration supports the interim goal of no overall net loss of the Nation's remaining wetlands, and the long-term goal of increasing the quality and quantity of the Nation's wetlands resource base;
- 2) Regulatory programs must be efficient, fair, flexible, and predictable, and must be administered in a manner that avoids unnecessary impacts upon private property and the regulated public, and minimizes those effects that cannot be avoided, while providing effective protection for wetlands. Duplication among regulatory agencies must be

avoided and the public must have a clear understanding of regulatory requirements and various agency roles;

3) Non-regulatory programs, such as advance planning; wetlands restoration, inventory, and research; and public/private cooperative efforts must be encouraged to reduce the Federal government's reliance upon regulatory programs as the primary means to protect wetlands resources and to accomplish long-term wetlands gains;

4) The Federal government should expand partnerships with State, Tribal, and local governments, the private sector and individual citizens and approach wetlands protection and restoration in an ecosystem/watershed context; and

5) Federal wetlands policy should be based upon the best scientific information available.

## **V. A COMPREHENSIVE PACKAGE OF REFORMS**

Building upon these principles, the working group has developed a comprehensive package of initiatives that will significantly reform Federal wetlands policy, while maintaining protection of this vital natural resource. This package includes regulatory reforms and innovative, non-regulatory policy approaches; it includes administrative actions that will take effect immediately, and legislative recommendations for Congress to consider during the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. The Clinton Administration looks forward to working closely with the Congress to implement this new approach to Federal wetlands policy. In addition, the Administration will establish an ongoing interagency working group, to be chaired by the Office on Environmental Policy, to monitor the implementation of the initiatives contained in the reform package.

The reform package includes the following initiatives:

- To affirm its commitment to conserving wetlands resources, the Administration will issue an Executive Order embracing the interim goal of no overall net loss of the Nation's remaining wetlands resource base, and a long-term goal of increasing the quality and quantity of the Nation's wetlands;
- To increase fairness in the wetlands permitting process, the Corps will establish an administrative appeals process so that landowners can seek recourse short of going to court;
- To increase fairness and efficiency in the wetlands permitting process, the Corps will establish deadlines for wetlands permitting decisions under the Clean Water Act; To reduce uncertainty for American farmers, yesterday the Corps and EPA issued a final regulation ensuring that approximately 53 million acres of prior converted cropland -- areas which no longer exhibit wetlands characteristics -- will not be subject to wetlands regulations;
- To reduce duplication and inconsistency for American farmers, the Soil Conservation Service will be the lead Federal agency responsible for identifying wetlands on agricultural lands under both the Clean Water Act and the Food Security Act;

- To close a loophole that has led to the degradation and destruction of wetlands, yesterday the Corps and EPA issued a final regulation to clarify the scope of activities regulated under the Clean Water Act;
- To emphasize that all wetlands are not of equal value, yesterday EPA and the Corps issued guidance to field staff highlighting the flexibility that exists to apply less vigorous permit review to small projects with minor environmental impacts;
- To ensure consistency and fairness, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service will all use the same procedures to identify wetland areas;
- To increase the predictability and environmental effectiveness of the Clean Water Act regulatory program and to help attain the no overall net loss goal, the Administration endorses the use of mitigation banks;
- To reduce the conflict that can result between wetlands protection and development when decisions are made on a permit- by-permit basis, the Administration strongly supports incentives for States and localities to engage in watershed planning;
- To provide effective incentives for farmers to restore wetlands on their property, the Administration will continue to support increased funding for the USDA's Wetland Reserve Program; and
- To attain the long-term goal of increasing the quantity and quality of the Nation's wetlands, the Administration will promote the restoration of damaged wetland areas through voluntary, non-regulatory programs. The complete package of reform initiatives follows. (Some initiatives are listed under more than one heading for the sake of clarity.) By proposing an approach based upon effective protection and restoration of the Nation's wetlands, while adopting much-needed reforms to increase the fairness and flexibility of regulatory programs, the Administration's reform package offers a tremendous opportunity to move beyond the divisiveness that has characterized the wetlands policy debate in recent years.

## **A. ADDRESSING LANDOWNER CONCERNS**

**Issue Definition:** The program that regulates wetlands under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act has been criticized as being slow, unpredictable and unfair. For example, it has been claimed that permits take too long to obtain; that wetlands delineations are sometimes slow, inaccurate, and inconsistent; and that it is unfair that the Corps does not provide a process by which landowners can appeal a jurisdictional determination or the denial of a wetlands permit short of suffering the expense of going to court.

**Administration Position:** The Clinton Administration believes that the Federal government has a responsibility to the public to conduct such regulatory programs in a manner that is efficient, responsive and fair. Therefore, the Administration supports the following reforms that will reduce the impact of regulation on the public, while meeting our objectives to protect wetlands:

- *Deadlines for Permit Action* Within one year the Corps will modify its regulations, through a public rulemaking process, to establish regulatory deadlines

for reaching decisions regarding permit applications. The regulations will generally require the Corps to reach permit decisions within 90 days from the date of issuance of the public notice, unless precluded by other laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act. The Administration will strongly support the additional personnel and funding necessary to meet these deadlines for permit action.

- *The Adoption of an Appeals Process* Within one year, the Corps will develop an administrative appeals process under the Section 404 regulatory program. The process, which will be implemented after a public rulemaking, will be designed to allow for administrative appeals of the Corps' determination that it has regulatory jurisdiction over a particular parcel of property, permit denials, and administrative penalties. The process will allow third parties to participate in applicant appeals of permit denials and will require that applicants exercise their right to appeal before initiating judicial action. The Administration will strongly support the additional personnel and funding necessary to implement successfully the appeals process. The USDA already has an appeals process in place and landowners will be able to appeal SCS wetlands delineations through that administrative process.
- *Delineation Training and Certification* All employees of Federal agencies who conduct wetlands delineations will be required to complete the interagency wetlands delineation training program to improve accuracy and consistency in delineation in Federal wetlands programs or have comparable training and experience. As appropriate, State and Tribal agencies will also be encouraged to participate in the Federal training program. In addition, by the end of 1993, the Corps will propose regulations for implementing a certification program for private sector delineators.  
By requiring training of Federal delineators, jurisdictional determinations can be done more accurately and consistently across the country. By encouraging the growth of a pool of certified private sector wetlands consultants, jurisdictional determinations can be performed far more quickly than if the job is solely the responsibility of Federal agency personnel. In addition, the Corps will streamline the process by which it considers and accepts delineations performed by certified wetlands consultants.
- *Promote Voluntary, Cooperative Programs.* With 75 percent of the Nation's remaining wetlands in the lower 48 States located on privately owned property, it is clear that cooperation with the private sector in implementation of wetlands protection and restoration activities is critical. Advance planning (see next issue) offers an excellent opportunity to involve the public in general, and property owners in particular, in developing and implementing wetlands protection and restoration plans. The Administration will support planning activities that include cooperative activities with property owners, and will increase support for programs that assist landowners in the implementation of such plans through restoration, technical assistance and information programs.

## **B. ADVANCE PLANNING AND WATERSHED MANAGEMENT**

**Issue Definition:** Typically, decisions affecting wetlands are made on a project-by-project, permit-by-permit basis. This often precludes the effective consideration of the cumulative effects of piecemeal wetlands loss and degradation. It also hampers the ability of State, Tribal, regional, and local governments to integrate wetlands conservation objectives into the planning, management, and regulatory tools they use to make decisions regarding development and other natural resource issues. This can often result in inconsistent and inefficient efforts among agencies at all levels of government, and frustration and confusion among the public.

In contrast, advance planning, particularly comprehensive planning conducted on a watershed basis, offers the opportunity to have strong participation by State, Tribal, and local governments and private citizens in designing and implementing specific solutions to the most pressing environmental problems of that watershed. Advance planning generally involves at least the identification, mapping, and preliminary assessment of relative wetland functions within the planning area. More comprehensive advance planning may identify wetlands that merit a high level of protection and others that may be considered for development, and may also incorporate wetlands conservation into overall land use planning at the local level. Advance planning can provide greater predictability and certainty to property owners, developers, project planners, and local governments.

**Administration Position:** To encourage greater use of comprehensive advance planning, particularly with State, Tribal, regional, and local involvement, and to identify wetlands protection and restoration needs, opportunities, and concerns, the Administration supports the following actions:

- *Provide Incentives for States/Locals to Integrate Watershed and Wetlands Planning.* The Clean Water Act should authorize the development of State watershed protection programs, which should include local and regional involvement and Federal approval of the State programs. Wetlands should be incorporated into the overall watershed approach, with minimum standards for wetlands protection and restoration planning. Approved watershed plans would receive a high priority for technical and financial support for activities such as mitigation banking, advance identification, and watershed-based categorization under the Section 404 regulatory program. There would also be a high priority given to developing Programmatic General Permits that defer to local regulatory programs implementing approved watershed plans.
- *Endorse State/Tribal Wetlands Conservation Plans.* Congress should endorse the development of State/Tribal comprehensive wetland plans, with the goal of supporting State and Tribal efforts to protect and manage their wetlands resources. EPA is currently funding the development of 22 State Wetlands Conservation Plans; Congress should provide EPA the authority to use its Wetlands Grants program to fund both their development and implementation.
- *Provide for Greater Integration of Advance Planning Into the Section 404 Regulatory Program.* The Administration will support efforts to better integrate advance planning into the Section 404 regulatory program, including appropriate

local or watershed-based categorization frameworks and regionalized improvements to implementation of the existing Nationwide Permit 26 in headwaters and isolated waters. Such opportunities are expected to grow as States, Tribes, and regional and local governments progress on watershed plans, State Wetlands Conservation Plans, and other wetlands-related planning processes. Where State, Tribal, regional, or local governments have approved watershed plans that address wetlands, EPA and the Corps will give high priority to assisting with the development of categorization of wetland resources for the purpose of Section 404. Categorization approaches should be local or regional in nature, and reflect the full range of impacts and functions that affect wetlands within the watershed or planning area.

- *Programmatic General Permits (PGPs) Under Section 404.* The Corps will issue guidance which specifies the circumstances under which State, Tribal, regional, and local governments with existing regulatory programs may assume a more active role in wetlands protection while reducing duplication with Federal programs. PGPs are extremely useful in reducing unnecessary duplication between Federal and non-Federal regulatory programs and in generally enhancing the role of State and local governments and of advance planning, in decisions regarding wetlands and other aquatic resources. The Administration recommends that Congress amend Section 404(e) of the Clean Water Act to provide explicitly for issuance of PGPs, with appropriate environmental safeguards, for approved State, Tribal, regional, and local regulatory programs.
- *Improve Nationwide Permit 26 Through Regionalization.* In order to improve the implementation of existing Nationwide Permit 26 (NWP 26) in isolated waters and in headwater areas, the Corps, in coordination with appropriate Federal, State, and Tribal agencies, and with the opportunity for public notice and comment, will undertake a field level review of NWP 26 to develop regional descriptions of the types of waters, and the nature of activities in those waters that will not be subject to authorization under NWP 26. Advance planning efforts that have assessed the functions and values of local isolated wetlands and headwaters, and have considered factors such as cumulative losses and scarcity of particular classes of waters, will be used to facilitate this effort.
- *Mitigation Banking.* Wetland mitigation banking refers to the restoration, creation, enhancement, and, in certain defined circumstances, preservation of wetlands expressly for the purpose of providing compensatory mitigation in advance of discharges into wetlands authorized under the Section 404 regulatory program. Advance planning can be used to identify appropriate locations for, and uses of, mitigation banks. EPA and the Corps have issued guidance to their field staff that clarifies the manner in which wetlands mitigation banking fits in the Section 404 regulatory program. Congress should endorse the appropriate use of banking, with environmental safeguards, as a compensatory mitigation option under the Section 404 regulatory program, and explicitly allow use of the State Revolving Fund to capitalize mitigation banks.
- *Promote Voluntary, Cooperative Programs.* With approximately 75 percent of the Nation's remaining wetlands in the lower 48 States located on privately owned property, it is clear that cooperation with the private sector in implementation of

wetlands protection and restoration activities is critical. Advance planning offers an excellent opportunity to involve the public in general, and property owners in particular, in developing and implementing wetlands protection and restoration plans. The Administration will support planning activities that include cooperative activities with property owners, and will increase support for programs that assist landowners in the implementation of such plans through restoration, technical assistance, and education and information programs.

- *Revise the Executive Order on Wetlands.* The existing Executive Order on wetlands (E.O.11990) will be revised to direct the Federal agencies to take a watershed/ecosystem approach to wetlands protection and restoration. In addition, it will require Federal agencies that conduct or assist with multi- objective natural resource planning to incorporate wetlands protection into their programs to the extent practicable.
- *Provide Better and Coordinated Information and Technical Assistance on Wetland Issues.* The Federal agencies will coordinate efforts to provide States, Tribes, regional and local governments, and the public with timely, consistent information concerning wetlands programs. The agencies will develop a strategic plan for delivering information on regulatory programs, and encourage the development of innovative education and outreach materials and initiatives to assist the public in understanding wetlands issues.  
The Administration will also direct the Wetlands Subcommittee of the Federal Geographic Data Committee to complete reconciliation and integration of all Federal agency wetland inventory activities. In addition, the Administration will coordinate wetlands restoration, research, inventory, monitoring, cooperative programs, and information and education activities.

## C. AGRICULTURE

**Issue Definition:** Two Federal statutes regulate certain activities in wetlands on agricultural lands. The Food Security Act Wetlands Conservation provision, which is known as the Swampbuster program, is administered by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. The Clean Water Act Section 404 program is administered jointly by the Department of the Army and the Environmental Protection Agency. American farmers have at times been subjected to needless duplication and frustrating inconsistency in the implementation of these two statutes.

**Administration Position:** The Administration recognizes the valuable contribution of agricultural producers to the Nation's economy and more generally to the American way of life. We also appreciate the challenges faced by farmers as they try to comply with wetlands regulations, as well as other environmental requirements affecting farm operations. As a result, the Administration is committed to ensuring that Federal wetlands programs do not place unnecessary restrictions or burdens on farmers and other landowners, while providing necessary environmental safeguards.

The Administration has identified a number of actions that can be taken to reduce the impact of these two wetlands protection programs on American agriculture. At the heart of this effort is a commitment on the part of all Federal agencies involved to work closely and cooperatively to coordinate their work under these two statutes so as to increase efficiency, minimize duplication, and reduce inconsistencies between the programs.

The following initiatives demonstrate our commitment to protect and restore the Nation's wetlands and eliminate unnecessary impacts on the farm community:

- *Prior Converted Cropland Rulemaking.* EPA and the Corps have just completed a rulemaking which assures American farmers that an estimated 53 million acres of prior converted cropland will not be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. These lands were converted from wetlands to croplands prior to the passage of the Food Security Act of 1985, which established the Swampbuster program, and no longer exhibit wetlands characteristics. The Administration is also recommending that Congress include in the Clean Water Act a definition of "waters of the United States" that explicitly excludes from Clean Water Act jurisdiction areas determined to be prior converted cropland.
- *A Package to Eliminate Duplication and Inconsistency*  
The SCS, EPA, the Corps, and FWS signed an interagency agreement on August 23, 1993 that will reduce existing overlap and inconsistencies in the implementation of Federal wetlands programs affecting agricultural lands by undertaking, within 120 days, the following initiatives:
  - *Make the SCS the Lead Agency on Agricultural Lands.* The SCS, the Corps, EPA, and FWS will develop procedures to provide that SCS wetland delineations will represent the final government position on the extent of Swampbuster and Clean Water Act jurisdiction on agricultural lands. Interagency training programs will be developed to ensure that agency field staff are properly trained, that standard, agreed-upon methods are utilized in making delineation and mitigation determinations, and that EPA and the Corps, consistent with their statutory authorities, have the ability to monitor SCS determinations on a programmatic basis. SCS, EPA and the Corps will also coordinate enforcement responsibilities on agricultural lands to ensure that the Federal government's activities are equitable, and consistent.
  - *Guarantee Consistency in Delineations on Agricultural Lands.* In order to ensure consistency in identifying wetlands on agricultural lands, the Corps, EPA, SCS, and FWS will all use the same procedures to delineate wetlands. The agencies will develop field guidance for implementing the 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual to establish procedures for identifying wetlands in areas managed for agriculture. The agencies will also expedite current efforts to revise the SCS Food Security Act Manual to eliminate inconsistencies between wetlands delineation procedures in the FSA Manual and the 1987 Manual.
  - *Greatly Increase Farmers' Certainty in Agency Decisions.* The Corps, in coordination with EPA, SCS, and FWS, will propose a Nationwide

General Permit for discharges associated with "minimal effects" and "frequently cropped with mitigation" conversions determined by SCS and FWS to qualify for exemption from Swampbuster provisions. This will provide greater certainty to the Nation's farmers that they can rely on SCS/FWS mitigation determinations. While the Nationwide permit will include appropriate conditions to protect valuable wetlands, an individual review by the Corps and EPA will generally not be required.

- *Clarify that Certain Man-Made Wetlands Are Not Jurisdictional.* The Corps and EPA will incorporate examples of certain man-made wetlands, such as non-tidal drainage and irrigation ditches excavated on upland, and irrigated lands that would revert to upland if irrigation ceased, into their regulations to clarify the types of waters that are generally not subject to Clean Water Act jurisdiction because they are created out of upland.
- *Wetlands Reserve Program.* The Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) offers a significant opportunity to assist farmers who are interested in restoring wetlands on their property. Response by farmers to the nine State pilot program was overwhelming, with proposals for 250,000 acres of restoration by over 2300 farmers. The 1994 Appropriations conference report provides for 75,000 new acres to be enrolled in the WRP. When passed this will more than double -- to 20 -- the number of states where producers can participate in the program. The recent Midwest flood has created a particularly pressing need to assist farmers in the voluntary restoration of wetlands that have historically provided valuable flood protection. Congress should fully fund the Administration's budget requests for the WRP in 1995, and should expand the program in the 1995 Farm Bill.

#### **D. CATEGORIZATION**

**Issue Definition:** A persistent criticism of the Section 404 regulatory program is that the permit process is inflexible to the extent that "all wetlands are treated the same" from a regulatory perspective. Such criticisms have led to calls for a nationwide categorization system to rank wetlands based upon their relative function and importance to society.

One proposed approach would require that all of the Nation's wetlands be mapped and categorized "up front" as either "high-", "medium-", or "low-value." The ranking based upon this a priori categorization would, in turn, govern the regulatory response at the time of a specific permit application. **Administration Position:** While conceptually a priori categorization and ranking may seem attractive, its technical, fiscal and environmental implications make it unworkable. For example, simply mapping the lower 48 States at a scale suitable for detailed regulatory use would involve a mammoth undertaking yielding nearly 14 million maps and costing in excess of \$500 million. Assessing the functions of every wetland in the country would be a far larger and more complicated task and would require staffing and funding many times that necessary to complete mapping alone.

There is currently no scientific basis for a nationwide ranking of functionally distinct and diverse wetland types; any such scheme would be extremely difficult and require many years to develop. The suggestion contained in one legislative proposal that the Federal

government buy all "high-value" wetlands would be infeasible from a budgetary standpoint. The Congressional Budget Office estimates the acquisition costs alone for the lower 48 States to range between \$10 billion and \$45 billion.

Finally, an a priori categorization and ranking approach would not provide for consideration of the individual impacts associated with specific projects. This makes little sense from the standpoint of either development or wetlands protection. For example, small projects with minor impacts would be arbitrarily prevented from proceeding in a "high-value" wetland area. At the same time, large and environmentally damaging projects would be automatically approved if they were located in "low-value" wetland areas. A nationwide a priori categorization scheme would further complicate the Section 404 program and would conflict with the Administration's goals of administering a scientifically sound regulatory program that is efficient, predictable and understandable.

In contrast to nationwide a priori categorization, opportunities exist to provide greater predictability and certainty in the regulatory process while increasing participation at the State and local levels. Local or regionally developed advance planning at the watershed level can provide a scientifically sound and workable framework for early consideration of variations in wetland functions within the Section 404 program. Appropriate functional assessment techniques can be applied to all wetlands within the boundaries of a particular watershed or planning area, and reasonably foreseeable development needs can be superimposed upon this inventory and assessment to identify appropriate regulatory responses in advance of specific permit applications. Highly functional and ecologically significant wetlands can be identified as deserving a very high standard of protection; conversely, wetlands with limited function and ecological significance, or activities that would cause minimal environmental harm, can be identified as appropriate for general permits or other regulatory streamlining methods.

In the context of individual permit reviews, the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines currently provide the Corps and EPA with the flexibility to appropriately scale the regulatory response to reflect the relative function of the affected wetland, the character of the proposed discharge, and the probable environmental impact.

The Administration recognizes that "all wetlands are not the same" and that permit applicants deserve a timely and predictable regulatory response that is appropriate for the project being proposed. To this end, the Administration proposes the following actions:

- *Issue Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines Flexibility Guidance.* EPA and the Corps have issued guidance to their field staff to clarify and standardize implementation of the flexibility afforded by the 404(b)(1) Guidelines to make regulatory decisions regarding the analysis of project alternatives based on the relative severity of the environmental impact of proposed discharges. This guidance clarifies that small projects with minor impacts are subject to less rigorous permit review than larger projects with more substantial environmental impacts.
- *Develop Improved Analytical Tools for Wetlands Functional Assessment.* The agencies will expedite development of a new approach for wetland functional

assessment known as the Hydrogeomorphic Classification System (HGM). The HGM methodology is being developed by the agencies and the academic community as an improved analytical tool to make timely and accurate assessments of wetland functions. This tool will assist the agencies in assessing the relative severity of environmental impact of proposed discharges to determine an appropriate regulatory response consistent with the 404(b)(1) Guidelines flexibility guidance referenced above.

- *Encourage Advance Planning Efforts.* The agencies will provide technical assistance for advance planning efforts addressing wetlands conservation, and will counsel planning participants on methods to link local or regional planning with Section 404 regulatory decision making. Wetland categorization will be supported within the context of an approved advance plan to provide landowners with early identification and characterization of wetlands on their property, streamlined permit review, and more flexible mitigation sequencing where appropriate.
- *Regionalize General Permits for Activities in Defined Categories of Waters.* The Section 404 program already embodies a form of wetlands categorization through use of Nationwide Permit 26 (NWP 26), a "category of waters" general permit that authorizes discharges into isolated waters and headwaters. The Corps will undertake, in close coordination with relevant State and Federal agencies, a field level review and evaluation of NWP 26 for the purpose of regionalizing and improving its use. Congress should amend Section 404(e) to recognize the concept of regionalized "category of waters" general permits.

## **E. GEOGRAPHIC JURISDICTION**

The term "geographic jurisdiction" encompasses a set of wetlands issues that concern the determination of which waters fall within the jurisdiction of the Section 404 program of the Clean Water Act. These issues include the delineation manual that specifies the methodology by which wetlands are identified; the definitions of "wetlands" and "waters of the United States;" "artificial" wetlands; and isolated waters. (For "Delineation Training and Certification" see ADDRESSING LANDOWNER CONCERNS.)

### **Issue Definition: Delineation Manual**

As previously indicated, there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding the manuals that Federal agencies use in the field to delineate wetlands. The 1989 Manual was strongly criticized by some who claimed that it was an attempt by the bureaucracy to greatly expand the geographic jurisdiction of wetlands regulation without opportunity for public involvement. The proposed 1991 Manual that followed was roundly criticized by those who claimed that it would greatly reduce the scope of geographic jurisdiction applied to wetlands. In an attempt to resolve this controversy, in the fall of 1992 the Congress directed EPA to fund a National Academy of Science (NAS) study of wetlands delineation. That study is expected to be completed in the Fall of 1994. Since January 1993, both the Corps and EPA have adopted the 1987 Manual, which was in use in some parts of the country prior to the issuance of the 1989 Manual.

**Administration Position:** The Clinton Administration supports the use of the 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual by the Corps, EPA, SCS, and FWS pending the evaluation of the NAS study. (See "Guarantee Consistency in Delineations on Agricultural Lands" under AGRICULTURE.) The use of the 1987 Manual by the Corps and EPA has increased confidence and consistency in identifying wetlands and has diminished the controversy associated with the 1989 and 1991 manuals. If the Federal agencies jointly conclude that the 1987 Manual should be revised to respond to recommendations of the NAS, any proposed changes will be the subject of a process that will provide full opportunity for public comment. In addition, any proposed changes will be field tested by the agencies prior to final adoption to determine their impact in the real world.

To increase public confidence in the Section 404 regulatory program, the Administration recommends that the Congress endorse the continued use of the 1987 Manual in the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act, pending recommendations that may result from the NAS study.

**Issue Definition: Defining "Waters of the U.S." and "Wetlands"**

The Clean Water Act regulates discharges to "navigable waters," which are defined in the statute as "waters of the United States." However, the Act does not contain a definition of "waters of the United States." Similarly, while the Act refers to "wetlands," the statute does not define the term. Explicit definitions of these terms in the statute, consistent with longstanding regulatory definitions, would clarify Congressional intent with regard to the scope of geographic jurisdiction under the Act.

**Administration Position:** The Administration recommends that Congress incorporate the definition of "waters of the United States" contained in existing EPA and Corps implementing regulations. To provide additional consistency among Clean Water Act and Food Security Act programs, Congress should also incorporate the definition of "wetlands" contained in the Clean Water Act regulatory definitions, which is essentially identical to the wetlands definition in the 1990 Farm Bill. (The Clean Water Act regulatory definition of wetlands is preferable because some States have used the definition in State wetlands statutes. To adopt a different definition at Federal and State levels of government would only create further confusion in the regulatory program.)

The EPA/Corps definition of "waters of the United States" explicitly includes recently promulgated language clarifying that "prior converted croplands" are not waters of the United States for purposes of the Clean Water Act. Congress should include this clarifying language in statute as well.

The Administration also recommends that Congress add examples of "isolated waters" (e.g., prairie potholes, vernal pools, and playa lakes) to the statutory definition of wetlands. From a scientific standpoint, isolated wetlands perform many of the same vital functions performed by other aquatic areas widely accepted as wetlands, such as flood control and groundwater recharge, as well as providing critical habitat for migratory waterfowl and other wildlife, and contribute to achieving the objectives of the Clean Water Act both individually and as a class.

**Issue Definition: "Artificial" Wetlands**

Neither the Clean Water Act nor its implementing regulations distinguishes between natural and created wetlands. However, certain "artificial" wetlands do not normally exhibit the values and functions typically attributed to natural wetlands. These artificial wetlands are created inadvertently from upland by human activity and would revert to upland if such activity ceased. The fact that these areas are not specifically excluded from the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act in either statute or regulation has caused confusion.

**Administration Position:** The EPA and the Corps will incorporate examples of artificial wetlands, such as non-tidal drainage and irrigation ditches excavated on upland, into their regulations to clarify the types of waters that are generally not subject to Clean Water Act jurisdiction because they are created out of upland.

**F. MITIGATION AND MITIGATION BANKING**

**Issue Definition:** Mitigating the harmful effects of necessary development actions on the Nation's waters is a central premise of Federal wetland regulatory programs. The Section 404 regulatory program relies upon a sequential approach to mitigating these harmful effects by first avoiding unnecessary impacts, then minimizing environmental harm, and, finally, compensating for remaining unavoidable damage to wetlands and other waters through, for example, the restoration or creation of wetlands.

Mitigation banking refers to a wetland restoration, creation, or enhancement effort undertaken expressly for the purpose of compensating for unavoidable wetland losses in advance of development actions, when compensatory mitigation is not appropriate, practicable, or as environmentally beneficial at the development site. Units of restored or created wetland are expressed as "credits", and accumulated credits are subsequently withdrawn to offset "debits" incurred at the development site.

**Administration Position:** The sequential approach to mitigation provides a logical, predictable, and reasonable framework for mitigating impacts associated with proposed development actions. The Administration supports the use of mitigation banking in appropriate circumstances as a means of compensating for authorized wetland impacts.

The Administration is proposing the following actions to ensure that mitigation of environmental impacts within the Section 404 program is effective, predictable, and consistent with a watershed management perspective:

- **Issue Mitigation Planning Guidance.** The Corps, in coordination with EPA, FWS, SCS, and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), will issue guidance to their field staff to clarify the requirements for developing compensatory mitigation conditions in Section 404 permits. This guidance is intended to increase the success of mitigation projects in offsetting impacts to wetlands and other waters resulting from permitted activities. This guidance will assist permit

applicants by providing greater consistency and certainty with regard to how Section 404 mitigation requirements are applied.

- Endorse the Use of Mitigation Banking Under the Section 404 Regulatory Program. While a number of technical and procedural questions regarding the establishment and long term management of mitigation banks remain, conceptually mitigation banking, with appropriate environment safeguards, offers numerous advantages. Banking provides for greater certainty of successful compensatory mitigation in the permit process by requiring mitigation to be established before permits are issued. Banks are often ecologically advantageous because they consolidate fragmented wetland mitigation projects into one large contiguous parcel that can more effectively replace the lost wetland functions within the watershed. Mitigation banks also provide a framework for financial resources, planning and technical expertise to be brought together in a fashion often not possible with smaller mitigation projects.  
Recognizing the advantages offered by mitigation banking to compensate for wetlands losses, Congress should endorse the appropriate use of banking as a compensatory mitigation option under the Section 404 regulatory program, within environmentally sound limits. Congress should also explicitly allow use of the State Revolving Fund by States to capitalize mitigation banks.
- Issue Mitigation Banking Guidance. EPA and the Corps, in coordination with FWS, NMFS, and SCS have issued guidance to their field staff to clarify the manner in which wetlands mitigation banking is appropriately used within the Section 404 regulatory program. This guidance provides interim direction pending the results of additional studies, but will encourage, within environmentally sound limits, the use of mitigation banks for compensatory mitigation under Section 404.
- Develop Improved Analytical Tools. The agencies will expedite current efforts being coordinated by the Corps Waterways Experiment Station to develop an improved wetland functional assessment tool, the Hydrogeomorphic Classification System, to assist in conducting impact analysis and determining appropriate and effective mitigation measures.

## **G. RESTORATION**

**Issue Definition:** This Nation has lost nearly half of the wetland acreage that existed in the lower 48 States prior to European settlement. Much of this loss was due to Federal policies from an earlier era that encouraged the drainage of wetlands. The effect of this wetland loss is reflected in declining populations of fish, waterfowl, and other living things dependent upon the aquatic environment; in degraded water quality; and, most recently, in the extent of flooding in the Midwest.

The Section 404 regulatory program under the Clean Water Act and the Swampbuster provisions under the Food Security Act are attempts to stem this loss of wetlands. At best, the regulatory approach can ensure no further overall net loss. But to achieve a positive increase in the Nation's wetlands will require the restoration of some damaged wetlands.

Our ability to restore wetlands, particularly inland wetlands in agricultural areas, has been well-established over the last decade. A number of private and governmental entities have successfully restored degraded or lost wetlands to productive status. For example, the Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with private landowners across the Nation, has implemented 9,500 restoration projects affecting 200,000 acres. Last year, a 50,000 acre pilot of the USDA Wetlands Reserve Program received proposals from 2,300 farmers to restore 500,000 acres.

**Administration Position:** Restoring some former wetlands that have been drained previously or otherwise destroyed to functioning wetlands is key to achieving the Administration's interim goal of no overall net loss of the Nation's remaining wetlands, and its long term goal to increase the quality and quantity of the Nation's wetlands base.

In support of a broad-based effort to restore a portion of the Nation's historic wetlands base that has been destroyed or degraded in the past, the Administration proposes to take the following actions:

- *Wetlands Reserve Program.* The fiscal year 1994 Agriculture Appropriations conference report provides for 75,000 new acres to be enrolled in the Wetlands Reserve Program. When passed this will also more than double - to 20 - the number of States eligible for participation in the program. The Administration will also use this program in the Midwest to restore wetlands in the course of providing financial assistance to farmers and improved flood protection for all those affected by the recent flooding. The Administration will also pursue full funding of the President's budget request for the Wetlands Reserve Program in FY 1995, and will seek to have this program expanded in the 1995 Farm Bill.
- *Promote Wetlands Restoration through Voluntary, Cooperative Programs and Outreach Activities.* Wetlands conservation efforts have historically focused largely on wetlands regulation and acquisition. These programs continue to be essential to a comprehensive strategy for achieving the Administration's wetlands goals. However, stemming the net loss of the Nation's wetlands base and achieving a long-term increase in wetlands acreage is dependent upon restoring wetlands that have been drained, diked, or otherwise destroyed in the past. The universe of restorable former wetlands is predominantly on private lands, and the Administration presently has in place a number of Federal programs that focus on or incorporate voluntary, cooperative efforts to restore wetlands on private lands (e.g., FWS's Partners for Wildlife program, Bay and Estuary program, and North American Waterfowl Management Plan Joint Ventures; USDA's Wetlands Reserve, Water Bank, Water Quality Incentives, Forestry Incentives, and Stewardship Incentives programs.) The Administration will review existing Federal programs that seek to restore wetlands through cooperative, voluntary agreements and outreach efforts with private and other non-Federal landowners, and will examine opportunities to expand such programs, including education and outreach activities.
- *Revise the Executive Order on Wetlands.* The existing executive order on wetlands will be revised to incorporate the Administration's interim and long term

wetland goals and to establish wetlands restoration as an essential vehicle for Federal and quasi-Federal agencies to achieve those goals through a voluntary approach.

## **H. ROLES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES**

**Issue Definition:** Public support for Federal wetlands protection programs, such as the Clean Water Act Section 404 regulatory program and the Food Security Act Swampbuster program, has suffered during recent years from a perception that multiple agency roles in the Administration of these programs has contributed to confusion, delays, overlap, and a general sense that no single agency is "in charge".

**Administration Position:** The Administration is initiating steps to streamline the implementation of Federal wetlands protection programs by reducing duplication, overlap, and delay. For example, a memorandum of agreement has recently been signed to give the Soil Conservation Service, in consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, the lead agency for making wetlands delineations and mitigation decisions on agricultural land (see AGRICULTURE).

The Administration is committed to providing for effective and timely participation by the agencies with roles in Federal programs affecting wetlands while emphasizing the ultimate role of a single Federal agency decisionmaker. This increased coordination among the relevant agencies will be accomplished through the following mechanism:

- Continue Implementation of the 1992 Interagency Section 404(q) MOAs. EPA, the Corps, FWS, and NMFS have issued guidance to their field staff to improve interagency coordination procedures established in the 1992 Memoranda of Agreement under Section 404(q). These MOAs define a process for expedited review and resolution of agency concerns regarding individual permit decisions. The MOAs also establish procedures for resolving concerns involving the implementation of Section 404 program policy that can be accomplished without delaying individual permit decisions. The agencies will continue to use the 1992 MOAs and, based on this experience, determine whether additional guidance or revisions to the MOAs are necessary. It is critical to the ultimate effectiveness of the Section 404 program to preserve the responsibilities of Federal resource agencies such as the EPA, FWS and NMFS to reflect their relative expertise and authorities while reducing duplication, overlap, and delay. It is equally critical to recognize and understand the Corps' leadership and final decision-making role as "project manager" for the evaluation of permit applications under the Section 404 regulatory program.

## **I. ROLE OF STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

**Issue Definition:** Decisions on where and how to protect or restore wetlands can be often most appropriately made at State, Tribal, or local levels. However, the current Section 404 regulatory program is run at the Federal level, except for certain waters in one State

(Michigan). Many States, Tribes, and local governments have their own wetlands programs, which often overlap, are inconsistent with, or are simply distinct from Federal programs. This has resulted in inefficiency, frustration by the regulated public, and significant confusion.

**Administration Position:** The Administration is committed to increasing State, Tribal, and local government roles in Federal wetlands protection and restoration efforts. To increase consistency and clarity and reduce the confusion generated by the current relationship between the Federal government and State, Tribal, and local governments in wetlands protection and restoration, and to bring decision making to more appropriate levels, the Administration is taking the following actions:

- *Assist States, Tribes, and Local Governments in Taking a Stronger Role in Wetlands Protection.* The Administration will provide technical and financial assistance and guidance to States, Tribes, and local governments to assist them in taking more of a leadership role in wetlands protection, e.g., through State/Tribal assumption of Section 404, development of comprehensive State/Tribal Wetland Conservation Plans, application of State/Tribal Section 401 Certification authority to wetlands, development of Programmatic General Permits under Section 404, and better coordination between State, Tribal, and local permit programs and the Section 404 program.
- *Provide Incentives for States, Tribes, and Regional and Local Governments to Integrate Watershed and Wetlands Planning.* The Clean Water Act should authorize the development of State/Tribal watershed protection programs, requiring local and regional involvement and Federal approval of the State/Tribal programs. Wetlands should be incorporated into the overall watershed approach, with minimum requirements for wetlands protection and restoration planning. Approved watershed plans would receive a high priority for technical and financial support for activities such as mitigation banking, advance identification, and categorization under the Section 404 regulatory program. There would also be a high priority given to developing Programmatic General Permits that defer to local regulatory programs implementing approved watershed plans.
- *Increase Deference to State, Tribal, Regional, and Local Wetlands Decisionmaking.* The Corps will issue guidance which specifies the circumstances under which State, Tribal, regional, and local programs can effectively regulate Section 404 activities, through issuance of Programmatic General Permits (PGPs). The guidance will also clarify the safeguards required to ensure that these programs adequately protect wetlands and other waters. The use of PGPs is designed to increase the roles of State, Tribal, regional, and local governments in wetlands protection, provide an incentive for watershed planning efforts, and reduce redundancy and overlap between these programs and the Federal Section 404 program. The Administration recommends that Congress amend Section 404(e) of the Clean Water Act to provide explicitly for issuance of PGPs with appropriate environmental safeguards for approved State, Tribal, regional, and local regulatory programs.

- *Endorse State/Tribal Wetlands Conservation Plans.* Congress should endorse the development of State/Tribal comprehensive wetland plans, with the goal of supporting State and Tribal efforts to protect and manage their wetlands resources. EPA is currently funding the development of 22 State Wetlands Conservation Plans; Congress should provide EPA the authority to use its Wetlands Grants program to fund both their development and implementation.
- *Encourage State/Tribal Assumption of Section 404.* Congress should provide EPA the authority to use its Wetlands Grants program to fund both development and implementation of State assumption of the Section 404 program. In addition, Congress should authorize partial assumption of the Section 404 program by States and Tribes as an interim step toward full assumption. By authorizing partial assumption of discrete areas within State or Tribal jurisdiction, the State/Tribe can get experience with the program as it develops full statutory equivalency, and the Federal government can defer to the State/Tribe as early as possible.
- *Provide States/Tribes with Access to Wetlands Delineation Training.* State and Tribal agencies will be encouraged to participate in the Federal interagency wetlands delineation training and certification programs to strengthen their abilities to conduct wetlands delineations, and to improve consistency in wetlands identification among State and Federal wetlands programs.

## **J. SCOPE OF REGULATED ACTIVITIES**

**Issue Definition:** The Clean Water Act Section 404 program regulates "discharges" of dredged and fill material to wetlands and other waters of the United States. In the past, these terms have been interpreted in a way that created regulatory "loopholes" under which certain projects could be designed, using expensive and sophisticated methods, so that they did not require Section 404 authorization.

The environmental effects of these projects on wetlands are no different than less sophisticated projects involving discharges of dredged or fill material, which have been regulated under Section 404. Also, these loopholes have led to inconsistencies in how the Section 404 program has been implemented around the country.

**Administration Position:** The Administration has issued a final regulation, and is asking Congress to take corresponding legislative action, to close these regulatory loopholes by clarifying the types of activities that involve discharges of dredged or fill material subject to Section 404 review.

The following actions will result in better protection of wetlands, and improve the fairness, predictability, and consistency of the Section 404 program.

- **Clarify Definition of "Discharge of Dredged Material."** Under the final rule, this term is defined to ensure that discharges into wetlands and other waters of the United States will be consistently regulated when they are associated with excavation activities, such as ditching, channelization, or mechanized landclearing, that have environmental effects of concern. The rule explicitly

- excludes from Section 404 regulation discharges associated with activities that have only de minimis, or inconsequential, environmental effects. In an effort to reduce the impact of these changes on the regulation of minor activities with only minimal adverse environmental effects, the Corps will coordinate with EPA to develop additional general permits authorizing such minor activities. The revised definition does not affect the existing exemptions in Section 404(f) for ongoing farming, ranching, and silvicultural activities.
- Clarify Definition of "Discharge of Fill Material." The agencies also are clarifying the definition of "discharge of fill material" to ensure that activities in waters of the United States that involve the non-traditional use of pilings (e.g., shopping malls, parking garages) will require Clean Water Act authorization. In an effort to reduce the impact of these changes on the regulation of minor activities with only minimal adverse environmental effects, the Corps will coordinate with EPA to develop additional general permits that authorize such activities.
  - Legislative Clarification of Scope of Activities Regulated Under Section 404. Congress should amend the Clean Water Act to make it consistent with the agencies' rulemaking.

## **K. STATE OF ALASKA**

**Issue Definition:** The extent and nature of Alaska wetlands reflect, in part, climatological and physiographic conditions found in no other State. More than 99 percent of Alaska's wetlands remain, and much of the State's developable lands are wetlands. This abundance of wetlands in combination with Alaska's short building season, leads some to claim that the Section 404 program places a heavier burden on Alaskans than on the rest of the country.

The previous Administration attempted to address some of these concerns by proposing the "Alaska 1% rule" which would have exempted wetlands in Alaska from mitigation requirements until one percent of Alaska's wetland resources had been developed. The "Alaska 1% rule" was published for public comment in November 1992, and 83 percent of the over 6,500 comments received objected to the rule, raising concerns about its potential impact on the environment.

Objections to the proposed rule focused on several key considerations:

- An additional 1.5 million acres of Alaska's wetlands would be destroyed before the one percent threshold would be met, including potentially all of Alaska's 345,000 acres of extremely valuable coastal wetlands. Wetlands losses in Alaska have historically been greatest in coastal areas where the State's population is concentrated. For example, losses of high value coastal wetlands near the cities of Anchorage and Juneau are estimated to exceed 50 percent of their historic base.
- The proposed rule would hinder management efforts for several Federally listed or proposed threatened and endangered species that utilize Alaska's coastal wetlands, as well as hastening the listing of additional candidate species.

- Although full in-kind compensation is often not possible or practicable, opportunities do exist for restoration or rehabilitation of disturbed areas in proximity to a proposed development that have the potential to benefit affected fish and wildlife populations.
- There is enough flexibility in the existing Section 404 regulatory program to respond to Alaska's unique concerns administratively. During the last 20 years, of the approximately 4,000 permit applications received by the Corps' Alaska District, only 108 (2.7 percent) were denied; the remaining applications were either issued as individual or general permits, or withdrawn. Of the more than 3,000 individual permits issued, only 15 (0.5 percent) required compensatory mitigation.

**Administration Position:** Because of the significant adverse environmental consequences that it would allow, the "Alaska 1% rule" will be withdrawn. The best way to address Alaska-specific concerns regarding the Section 404 program is through targeting the specific areas where questions about program policies or implementation have been raised. Finalizing the proposed "Alaska 1% rule" would have far broader and avoidable adverse environmental consequences.

The EPA and the Corps will, within the next 90 days, initiate meetings with the Federal resource agencies, State and local government agencies, representatives of native villages, industry groups including oil and fishing interests, and environmental groups, to consider other environmentally appropriate means to assure regulatory flexibility and the feasibility of alternative permitting procedures in Alaska.

In addition, the Administration is proposing a number of actions to improve implementation of the Section 404 regulatory program nationwide (e.g., issuing guidance on flexibility in the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, mitigation banking, mitigation planning, advance planning, programmatic general permits; establishing an administrative appeals process; providing for more explicit consideration of wetland functions; and regionalizing Nationwide Permit number 26. See earlier discussion for details). These actions, in combination with any Alaska-specific proposals developed as a result of the process outlined above, should contribute significantly to addressing Alaska's concerns with implementation of the Section 404 regulatory program.

## L. TAKINGS

**Issue Definition:** Some critics of the Section 404 regulatory program have asserted that Federal efforts to protect wetlands constitute a "taking" of private property and require compensation under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. Critics of the program have proposed legislation that would characterize permit denial decisions, and other Section 404 regulatory actions, as "takings" requiring compensation.

**Administration Position:** The Administration strongly supports private property rights. The equitable administration of any Federal regulatory program involves more than strict technical considerations and must include sensitivity to the rights and expectations of

citizens. Implementation of the Section 404 program often requires a balancing of environmental protection, public interests, and individual interests.

Many activities undertaken on wetlands either are not regulated at all, are explicitly exempted from regulation, or are authorized by general permits. In situations where individual permits are required, the Federal agencies can work with permit applicants to design projects that meet the requirements of the law and protect the environment and public safety, while protecting the property rights of the applicant. However, in rare instances the public interest in conserving wetlands may substantially interfere with the rights of landowners. In such instances, Federal action will be based on the proposition that restrictions on the actions of the property owners in question are called for in order to protect the property rights, safety, environmental or economic interests of other individuals or the community at large.

In those situations where the necessary restrictions on use amount to a taking of the property, the owner will, of course, be entitled to compensation. Moreover, where a property owner believes that government action amounts to a taking, the courts are available to review such claims and to determine whether compensation is due. Due to the unique nature of each situation, these issues must be considered on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, the Administration does not support a legislative approach to this issue.

The Administration is strongly committed to reducing the impact of the 404 program on landowners. Many of the Administration positions that have been described in this paper are designed to make the program as efficient, predictable, consistent, and equitable as possible (see ADDRESSING LANDOWNER CONCERNS, AGRICULTURE and CATEGORIZATION).

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

This comprehensive reform package represents a tremendous opportunity to move beyond the unnecessary polarization that has characterized the wetlands policy debate in recent years. While divisive, that debate has not been without value.

The critics of the wetlands regulatory program have performed a service to the country by highlighting the need for meaningful reform in the administration of wetland regulatory programs. Many of the much-needed reforms contained in this package -- such as permit deadlines, an appeals process, the use of mitigation banks, and increasing the role of State and local government in wetlands regulation -- have been proposed by critics of the current regulatory program.

The supporters of wetlands protection have also performed a service by helping to inform the Nation of the environmental and economic importance of wetlands, a vital natural resource that was once routinely destroyed. Their strong commitment to protecting and restoring this vital resource is also reflected in this package.

There will, no doubt, be individuals on each side of this divisive debate who will not be entirely pleased with every element of this reform package. But our approach provides effective protection of an important natural resource in a manner that is both fair and flexible, thus recognizing both the value of wetland resources and the need to minimize regulatory burdens.

## **VII. POSTSCRIPT: LESSONS FROM THE FLOOD**

The entire Nation shares the pain of those Americans experiencing the physical destruction and economic loss caused by the disastrous floods that have devastated the Nation's heartland. Many lives have been lost, and billions of dollars in damage have been caused to property and crops. In the short term, we must use the tools available to us to assist those struggling to deal with severe economic hardship due to the floods. We must concentrate our attention on helping people rebuild their lives by protecting our riverfront communities and providing assistance to businesses and the agricultural community adversely affected by the floods.

We must also look to the future, and learn from these floods how to more effectively protect human health and safety, property, and the environment. Many scientists have concluded that past manipulation of the rivers in the Midwest has contributed to the current level of devastation by separating the river channels from their natural floodplains, eliminating millions of acres of additional flood storage capacity. Wetlands within the floodplain and higher in the watershed reduce floods by absorbing rain, snow melt, and floodwaters and releasing it slowly, thereby reducing the severity of downstream flooding.

We must be cautious not to repeat policies and practices which may have added to the destruction caused by these floods. One way to assist landowners while alleviating some flood risks is through funding wetlands restoration and acquisition programs targeted to help those in flood-ravaged areas. Programs such as the USDA Wetlands Reserve Program provide farmers with much needed support and increase the quantity of flood-absorbing wetlands in this region.

Of course, we recognize that wetlands and river system restoration and protection alone will not suffice. It will be critically important that we quickly rebuild many of the flood control structures. However, we have learned the importance of also looking at alternative non-structural measures that may provide as much or better flood damage reduction at the same or lower cost. Such measures would include using more natural river corridor systems and wetlands. In the longer term, it is important that all potential flood control measures, both structural and non-structural, be considered and evaluated from a pragmatic and cost-benefit standpoint.

It is not a question of whether to protect cities and farms; it is a question of how best to protect them. In the case of riverfront communities, protective levees may be the only reasonable answer, but in other circumstances, non-structural measures may make more sense. We can identify ways to protect and restore our river and wetlands systems so that

they work for us, integrated with structural flood control measures. Of course, wetlands that provide flood control generally will also provide other important functions, such as fish and wildlife habitat, water quality improvement, and recreational opportunities. In our response to this flood-borne tragedy, the Administration will pursue measures that are the most effective means to prevent this catastrophe from happening again. Doubtless this will involve a combination of repair and construction of flood control structures together with restoration of natural flood attenuating river and wetlands systems.