UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF WATER

Memorandum on Endangered Species Act Section 7(a)(2) Consultation for State and Tribal Clean Water Act Section 404 Program Approvals

Pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), 33 U.S.C. 1344, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is authorized to permit the discharge of dredged or fill material into "waters of the United States." States and federally recognized tribes may assume authority to implement the CWA Section 404 permitting program within their respective jurisdictions from the Corps by submitting a request to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency), as Congress authorized the EPA Administrator to approve program transfers from the Corps to the states and tribes. In the past, EPA has taken the position that such program transfer decisions do not involve an exercise of discretion warranting consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), 16 U.S.C. 1536, meaning EPA would not need to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (hereafter referred to as "the Services") when acting on an assumption application from a state or tribe. EPA has reconsidered its prior position, articulated in 2010, that the decision to approve a state or tribal CWA Section 404 program does not trigger ESA Section 7 consultation. Going forward, EPA has determined that it should consult with the Services under Section 7 of the ESA if a decision to approve a state or tribal CWA Section 404 program may affect ESA-listed species or designated critical habitat.

I. Background

To assume the CWA Section 404 permitting program, states and tribes must develop permit programs for discharges of dredged or fill material consistent with the requirements of the CWA and implementing regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 233 and submit a request to assume any such program to EPA. States and tribes must administer and implement programs that are consistent with and no less stringent than the requirements of the CWA and implementing regulations. 40 C.F.R. 233.1(d). The Administrator "shall approve" an assumption request if the state or tribal program satisfies the requirements of the CWA Section 404(h)(1). 33 U.S.C. 1344(h)(2)(A). If the Administrator fails to make a determination within 120 days of receiving the request, the program shall be deemed approved. 33 U.S.C. 1344(h)(3).

Section 7 of the ESA directs each federal agency to ensure, in consultation with one or both of the Services, as appropriate, that "any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency … is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence" of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. 16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2). ESA Section 7 consultation is not required if the agency determines that an action will not affect listed species or designated critical habitat. ESA Section 7 applies to "all actions in which there is discretionary Federal involvement or control." 50 C.F.R. 402.03.

In December 2010, EPA articulated its position that ESA Section 7 consultation is not applicable to CWA Section 404 program transfer decisions. EPA stated at that time that a 2007 U.S. Supreme Court decision from another context, *Nat'l Ass'n of Home Builders v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 551 U.S. 644 (2007) ("*NAHB*"), controlled the inquiry. In *NAHB*, the Supreme Court held that because the transfer of CWA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting authority to a state "is not discretionary, but rather is mandated once a State has met the criteria set forth in Section 402(b) of the CWA, it follows that a transfer of NPDES permitting authority does not trigger Section 7(a)(2)'s consultation and no-jeopardy requirements." 551 U.S. at 673. The Supreme Court held that "[w]hile EPA may exercise some judgment in determining whether a State has demonstrated that it has the authority to carry out Section 402(b)'s enumerated statutory criteria, the statute clearly does not grant it the discretion to add an entirely separate prerequisite to the list. Nothing in the text of Section 402(b) authorizes the EPA to consider the protection of threatened or endangered species as an end in itself when evaluating a transfer application." *Id.* at 671.

EPA evaluated this decision in response to a December 6, 2010 letter sent to the Agency by the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) and the Association of State Wetland Managers (ASWM) asking whether EPA must conduct an ESA Section 7 consultation prior to approving or disapproving a Section 404 program request. The Agency responded to ECOS and ASWM in a December 27, 2010 letter ("2010 Letter"), see Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OW–2020–0008, stating that, as in the CWA Section 402(b) context, when considering a CWA Section 404 program transfer request, EPA is only permitted to evaluate the specified criteria in CWA Section 404(h) and does not have discretion to add requirements to the list in CWA Section 404(h), including considerations of potential impacts to endangered and threatened species through ESA Section 7 consultation with the Services.

EPA stated in the 2010 Letter that although there are some differences between CWA Sections 402 and 404, the Supreme Court's reasoning in *NAHB* applies to EPA's approval of a CWA Section 404(g) permitting program. Section 404(h)(2) of the CWA states that if the Administrator determines that a state program submitted under CWA Section 404(g)(1) has the authority set forth in CWA Section 404(h)(1), then the Administrator "shall approve" the state's application to transfer the CWA Section 404 permitting program. The 2010 Letter acknowledged that "there are some differences between § 402(b) and § 404(h)," but concluded that those differences did not render EPA's action approving a state CWA Section 404 program a "discretionary federal action." The letter did not address the specific differences between the approval requirements of the CWA Section 402 and 404 programs that EPA now recognizes are relevant to the applicability of ESA Section 7. The 2010 Letter concluded that EPA's decision as to whether to approve a state CWA Section 404 program action is non-discretionary and ESA consultation is not required.

In July 2019, EPA received a request from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) asking EPA to engage in an ESA Section 7 consultation with the Services in connection with EPA's initial review of Florida's request to assume the CWA Section 404 program. FDEP provided a white paper asserting that ESA Section 7 consultation is required in the CWA Section 404 assumption context based on the unique statutory text of CWA Section 404 and its associated legislative history, which, in FDEP's view, differs in critical respects from other state delegation programs administered by EPA to which ESA Section 7 does not apply. FDEP stated that EPA's position was articulated in a two-page letter a few weeks after receiving the ECOS and ASWM letter and failed to acknowledge the critical distinctions between the statutory text of CWA Section 404 and the Section 402 program at issue in *NAHB*. FDEP also questioned the 2010 Letter's reliance on the legislative history of CWA Section 404

to support the non-discretionary nature of a state assumption decision, arguing that the legislative history supports the opposite conclusion.

The white paper explained that when a state or tribe administers the CWA Section 404 program, permittees must avoid adverse impacts to listed species or otherwise seek an incidental take permit under ESA Section 10, which involves a burdensome process for both permit applicants and government agencies. The white paper characterized the lack of incidental take coverage in state- or tribe-assumed programs as a significant hurdle to establishing an effective and efficient CWA Section 404 program in Florida and estimated that approximately ten percent of CWA Section 404 permits issued in Florida require some form of incidental take coverage.

The white paper viewed a one-time ESA Section 7 programmatic consultation in connection with EPA's initial review of an assumption application as an efficient and legally-defensible approach to resolving the lack of incidental take coverage for permittees and permitting agencies. An ESA Section 7 consultation on EPA's potential approval of Florida's program would allow the Services to issue a programmatic biological opinion and a programmatic incidental take statement, which could identify procedural requirements for state permitting under CWA Section 404 needed to support the Services' determination that assumption would not result in jeopardy to any listed species. Subject to the Services' incidental take statement and provided these requirements are followed, FDEP stated that this process would bring state CWA Section 404 permits within the ESA Section 7(o)(2) exemption from take liability.

II. Public Comment

On May 21, 2020, EPA initiated a 45-day public comment period through an announcement in the Federal Register titled "Request for Comment on Whether EPA's Approval of a Clean Water Act Section 404 Program Is Nondiscretionary for Purposes of Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation" (Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OW-2020-0008). EPA sought public comment regarding whether to reconsider its position that it lacks discretionary involvement or control within the meaning of 50 C.F.R. 402.03 when acting on a state or tribal application to administer the CWA Section 404 program sufficient to trigger ESA Section 7 consultation requirements. EPA identified the positions articulated in the FDEP white paper, as well as other considerations that may be relevant to this issue, and requested comment on whether EPA can and should engage in an ESA Section 7 consultation with the Services in connection with EPA's initial review of a state or tribal request to assume the CWA Section 404 program. The public comment period closed on July 6, 2020, and EPA received comments from a variety of stakeholders.

Several commenters stated that EPA's decision regarding a request to assume the CWA Section 404 permit program involves an exercise of discretion warranting consultation under ESA Section 7. These commenters recommended that EPA engage in a single ESA Section 7 programmatic consultation with the Services in connection with EPA's initial review of an assumption application. The commenters said that this process would enable the Services to issue a programmatic biological opinion and a programmatic incidental take statement, which could identify procedural requirements for state and tribal CWA Section 404 permits. They indicated that this approach could support a determination on the part of the Services that assumption would not result in jeopardy to any listed species and would ensure that activities authorized under state- or tribal CWA Section 404 permits would not be liable for incidental take as long as the terms and conditions of permitting are met.

Other commenters agreed that EPA's approval of a state or tribal CWA Section 404 permitting program is discretionary and thus triggers the requirements for consultation under Section 7 of the ESA. However, the commenters expressed concern about how states or tribes would ensure that the ESA's requirements are being applied at the project-specific level. These commenters said that EPA's consultation regarding whether to approve or disapprove an assumption request does not alleviate ESA liability concerns related to actions authorized by future state or tribal CWA Section 404 permits.

Certain commenters asserted that the Supreme Court's decision in *NAHB* applies to EPA's approval of CWA Section 404 programs, in addition to its approval of CWA Section 402 programs, and therefore EPA lacks discretion to consult under ESA Section 7 in approving state or tribal requests to assume permitting authority under CWA Section 404. These commenters argued that EPA's role under both the CWA Section 402 and 404 programs is limited to determining whether states and tribes have the legal authority Congress has specified; if the criteria are satisfied, EPA lacks the discretion to deny an application. The commenters also expressed concern that, as a practical matter, the agencies will spend significant time and resources collecting data and conducting analyses for a consultation but may not ultimately provide states and private landowners with incidental take protection under the ESA.

III. ESA Section 7 Applies to CWA Section 404 Program Assumption Decisions

Following the release of the May 2020 Federal Register Notice and its review of public comments, EPA has reconsidered the position articulated in the 2010 Letter to ECOS and ASWM. EPA concludes that the Agency's decision as to whether to approve a state or tribal request to assume the CWA Section 404 permit program involves an exercise of discretion warranting consultation under ESA Section 7 if EPA determines that such an approval action may affect a listed species or designated critical habitat. EPA's current view is that the *NAHB* decision, while informative, does not control in the CWA Section 404 program assumption context because Congress established a framework in which ESA concerns could be addressed when delegating authority to the Agency to transfer permitting responsibility from the Corps to individual states and tribes. That ability is absent in the list of factors Congress instructed EPA to consider when authorizing states to take on NPDES permitting authority.

For example, CWA Section 404(h)(1)(A) requires the Administrator to determine whether a state or tribe seeking CWA Section 404 program assumption has the authority to issue permits which apply and assure compliance with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Those Guidelines include a provision that prohibits the permitting of a discharge if it jeopardizes the continued existence of endangered or threatened species or results in the likelihood of the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. 40 C.F.R. 230.10(b)(3). EPA's regulations state that in determining compliance with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, where ESA Section 7 consultation occurs, the Services' conclusions "concerning the impact of the discharge on threatened and endangered species and habitat shall be considered final." 40 C.F.R. 230.30(c). The CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines were first promulgated in 1975, including the current prohibition on issuing permits jeopardizing threatened or endangered species, *before* Congress enacted CWA Section 404(g). 40 Fed. Reg. 41,292, 41,296 (Sept. 5, 1975). Thus, Congress was aware when requiring state or tribal program compliance with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines that the no jeopardy mandate would apply to all permits issued by states and tribes.

Unlike the statutory construct governing EPA's delegation of NPDES program authority under CWA Section 402, EPA is required to seek and consider comments from the Services when deciding whether to approve a state or tribal request to assume the CWA Section 404 permitting program. Under CWA Section 404(g)(2), EPA must provide the Services with an opportunity to comment on a state or tribal

program submission. CWA Section 404(g)(2) provides that within ten days after receipt of a program assumption submission, EPA shall provide copies of the program application to the Corps and FWS. EPA extended that statutory direction to NMFS by regulation. 40 C.F.R. 233.15(d). CWA Section 404(h)(1) directs EPA to consider comments submitted by the Corps and FWS when determining whether a state or tribe has the requisite authority and meets the CWA statutory requirements with respect to implementing the CWA Section 404 program. EPA's regulations make clear that EPA should provide heightened attention to comments from the Services, providing that in issuing its approval or disapproval of a state or tribal program, EPA shall provide a responsiveness summary of significant comments received and its responses. EPA "shall respond individually to comments received from the Corps, FWS, and NMFS." 40 C.F.R. 233.15(g).

By requiring EPA to consider the Services' comments before deciding to approve an assumption request, and requiring states and tribes to comply with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines when issuing permits under an assumed program, the CWA provides EPA with discretionary involvement and control that triggers the need for ESA Section 7 consultation when EPA's action may affect listed species. EPA has discretion regarding *the extent to which* it takes into account the Services' comments and can do so with an eye towards ensuring compliance with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. States and tribes are not required to consult on their individual permitting decisions, see 16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2), so the program approval stage provides the most reasonable and efficient point in which to help ensure a process is in place to consider potential adverse impacts to species resulting from those permitting decisions. EPA has discretionary authority at that stage to shape program implementation to ensure compliance with the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. This discretionary authority is unique to the transfer of CWA Section 404 permitting authority. There is no requirement in CWA Section 402 for EPA to take into consideration the views of the Services, and there is no corollary in the CWA Section 402 program to the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. These provisions in CWA Section 404 provide discretion to EPA that is not present in the Section 402 context.

The legislative history of CWA Section 404 supports the argument for consultation. According to the Senate Report accompanying enactment of the assumption authority:

> The committee amendments relating to the Fish and Wildlife Service are designed to (1) recognize the particular expertise of that agency and the relationship between its goals for fish and wildlife protection and the goals of the Water Act, and (2) encourage the exercise of its capabilities in the early stages of planning. By soliciting the views of the principal Federal agencies involved in the review of these programs at an early stage, objections can be resolved that might otherwise surface later and impede the operation of a State program approved by the Administrator. This consultation preserves the Administrator's discretion in addressing the concerns of these agencies, yet affords them reasonable and early participation which can both strengthen the State program and avoid delays in implementation. That is, early participation in the development and design of programs, guidelines, and regulations should serve to reduce the emphasis now placed on the review by the Fish and Wildlife Service of individual applications for permits under the Water Act.

S. Rep. 95-370, at 78 (1977). The report expresses a preference for early engagement with FWS at the program approval stage with the goal of reducing engagement at the individual permitting stage while preventing comments at the permitting stage that might lead to a permit objection.

While the legislative history does not specifically mention ESA Section 7 consultation, Congress used the phrase "consultation" at the developmental stage of state programs while recognizing EPA's "discretion" in considering the FWS's comments and ensuring efficient and effective program implementation following approval. Ensuring that federal decisions contemplate, where appropriate, potential impacts to listed species at a stage where those impacts can be most efficiently addressed is one of the hallmarks of the ESA Section 7 consultation process. The legislative history therefore supports programmatic consultation more so than suggesting that formal consultation is not required.

In *NAHB*, the Supreme Court held that ESA Section 7 consultation on an NPDES program transfer could impose conditions beyond those found in Section 402(b). 551 U.S. at 663-664. The Court stated that "[w]hile EPA may exercise some judgment in determining whether a State has demonstrated that it has the authority to carry out Section 402(b)'s enumerated statutory criteria, the statute clearly does not grant it the discretion to add another entirely separate prerequisite to that list." *Id.* at 671. In the CWA Section 404 context, however, an ESA consultation will not impose an entirely separate condition. Instead, ESA consultation will fulfill Congress's statutory directive that the Services provide input on a state program prior to EPA's approval. By allowing for consideration of the views of the Services through their comments and incorporation of the no jeopardy requirement from the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, the statute provides authority for EPA to consult and consider protection of listed species in the approval decision.

In *NAHB*, the Supreme Court found that the canon against implied repeals supports the interpretation that the transfer of CWA Section 402 programs was a non-discretionary agency action. This reasoning is not applicable in the CWA Section 404 assumption context. The Court stated: "An agency cannot simultaneously obey the differing mandates set forth in Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA and the Section 402(b) of the CWA, and consequently the statutory language – read in light of the canon against implied repeals – does not itself provide clear guidance as to which command must give way." 551 U.S. at 666. In the CWA Section 402 context, the Court found that approval of the state's permitting authority was non-discretionary and "comports with the canon against implied repeals because it stays Section 7(a)(2)'s mandate where it would effectively override otherwise mandatory statutory duties." *Id.* at 670. CWA Section 404 is distinguishable from CWA Section 402 because Congress required EPA to solicit comment from the FWS at the program approval stage and because the statute incorporates the jeopardy prohibition by reference to the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Here, ESA Section 7(a)(2)'s mandate does not override EPA's statutory duties but instead fits into the existing statutory structure.

IV. Implementation

On August 20, 2020, EPA received a request from the State of Florida to assume administration of the CWA Section 404 program. For Florida and other states and tribes seeking to assume the CWA Section 404 program, EPA intends to engage in a one-time ESA Section 7 programmatic consultation with the Services in connection with the initial review of an assumption request if a

decision to approve a state or tribal CWA Section 404 program may affect ESA-listed species or designated critical habitat. To initiate consultation, the Agency will submit a biological evaluation to the Services, which evaluates the potential effects of EPA's potential approval of an assumption request on ESA-listed species, proposed species, designated critical habitat, and proposed critical habitat (50 C.F.R. 402.12). A biological evaluation also considers whether EPA's approval of an assumption request is likely to adversely affect any species or habitat.

For Florida and other states and tribes seeking to assume administration of the CWA Section 404 permitting program, EPA's engagement in a one-time ESA Section 7 programmatic consultation with the Services in connection with the initial review of an assumption application would allow one or both of the Services, as appropriate, to issue a programmatic biological opinion and programmatic incidental take statement for the state or tribal permitting program. The biological opinion and incidental take statement could establish additional procedural requirements and permitting conditions or measures that help ensure the state or tribal permitting program and individual permits issued pursuant to that program, as well as EPA's approval of that program, do not result in jeopardy to any listed species. This process, assuming compliance with any applicable permit conditions or measures, would extend ESA Section 9 liability protections to individual permits issued pursuant to the state or tribal program and place state and tribal CWA Section 404 permitting on equal footing with the Corps' permitting program. This streamlined permitting process would reduce costs and duplication of effort by state or tribal and federal authorities and facilitate more effective and efficient state and tribal CWA Section 404 programs. This programmatic consultation approach will ensure that listed species are protected while avoiding additional ESA Section 10 processes to obtain similar liability protections.

EPA disagrees with the comments stating that EPA's consultation regarding whether to approve or disapprove a request to assume the CWA Section 404 program does not alleviate existing ESA liability related to actions authorized by future state or tribal CWA Section 404 permits. The Services are required, as part of formal consultation, to prepare an incidental take statement if such take is reasonably certain to occur and will not violate ESA Section 7(a)(2). 50 C.F.R. 402.14(g)-(i). If, pursuant to the ESA regulations, the Services provide an incidental take statement, then "any taking which is subject to a statement as specified in [50 C.F.R. 402.14(i)(1)] and which is in compliance with the terms and conditions of that statement is not a prohibited taking under the [ESA], and no other authorization or permit under the [ESA] is required." 50 C.F.R. 402.14(i)(5).

At the individual permit level, the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines prohibit discharges that will likely jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species, or result in the likely destruction or adverse modification of habitat designated as critical for these species as determined by the Services. See 40 C.F.R. 233.20; 40 C.F.R. 230.10(b)(3). EPA anticipates that states and tribes may develop different program structures and coordination mechanisms to meet these requirements and any conditions of a programmatic incidental take statement, depending on factors such as the structure and expertise of the state and tribal agencies, provisions of state and tribal law, previous coordination among state or tribal and federal agencies, the number of ESA-considered species and extent of critical habitat, and other factors. States and tribes maintain the existing flexibilities in developing their CWA Section 404 programs to meet these requirements.

EPA's determination that CWA Section 404 provides the requisite discretionary involvement or control for the ESA to apply to EPA's approval of a state or tribal CWA Section 404 program does not modify or alter the application of the ESA to other EPA actions not analyzed here, such as actions under the CWA (other than state assumption of CWA Section 404 programs), Safe Drinking Water Act, the

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, or other statutes implemented by EPA. For example, there are significant differences in how the CWA Section 402 and 404 programs operate, legally and procedurally, and nothing in this memorandum modifies established precedent and procedures for the NPDES permitting program. Likewise, EPA's determination that EPA has the discretion to consult on CWA Section 404 program approvals does not apply to actions by other federal agencies. EPA and other federal agencies must evaluate each federal activity considering the relevant implementing statute and the relevant factual situations to determine if the ESA consultation requirement attaches.

DAVID ROSS Digitally signed by DAVID ROSS Date: 2020.08.27 13:35:21 -05'00'

David P. Ross, Date
Assistant Administrator