For Official Use Only – Pre-decisional Deliberative Information – Not for Public Release

ROLL OUT PLAN

Release of Federal Register Notice (FRN) Announcing NOAA and EPA's Final Decision Finding that Oregon Has Failed to Submit an Approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program

Action: Release of Federal Register Notice (FRN) Announcing NOAA and EPA's ~~Final Decision Finding~~ determination that Oregon Has Failed to Submit an Approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program

Date: To comply with a settlement agreement with the Northwest Environmental Advocates, on January 30, 2015, NOAA and EPA will notify the state of our determination ~~final decision~~. We will also inform the plaintiff and submit an FRN announcing the decision to the Office of the Federal Register for publication in the Federal Register 3-4 business days later.

Roll out lead:
Allison Castellan, NOS/OCM, (301) 563-1125 (NOAA/NOS lead for action)
Don Waye, EPA/OWOW (202) 566-1170
Jayne Carlin, EPA R10/OWW (206) 553-8512

NOAA Roll out team:

- National Ocean Service:
  - Allison Castellan, NOS/OCM (301) 563-1125 (lead for action)
  - Joelle Gore, NOS/OCM (301) 563-1177
  - Donna McCaskill, NOS/OCM Communications (843) 740-1272
  - Lindsey C. Williams, NOS Policy/Leg (301) 713-3070 x 115
- National Marine Fisheries Service
  - Kim Kratz, NMFS/WCR/WCRO/AOD (503) 231-2155
- NOAA Communications/ Public Affairs
  - @NOS - Ben Sherman (lead), Keeley Belva, (back-up), (301) 713-3066
  - @NMFS – Katherine Cheney, (503) 231-6730
- NOAA Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
  - Michael Dukes (202) 482-5597 (NOS portfolio)
  - Linda Belton (202) 482-5447 (Intergovernmental)
  - Christina Durham (202) 482-5935 (NFMS portfolio)
- NOAA PCO (NOS) – Adria Schneck-Scott (202) 482-1281
- NOAA General Counsel
  - Jeff Dillen (301) 713-7382

EPA Rollout team

- OWOW
  - Don Waye, EPA/OWOW (202) 566-1170
  - Lynda Hall, EPA/OWOW (202) 566-1210
  - Christine Psyk, EPA R10/OWW (206) 553-1906
  - Jayne Carlin, EPA R10/OWW (206) 553-8512

Prepared by: ACastellan (OCM)
Reviewed by:

- EPA Communications/Public Affairs
  - Marianne Holsman (206) 553-1237 (EPA NW)
- EPA Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
  - Sven-Erik Kaiser, Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov, (202) 566-2753
  - Greg Spraul, Spraul.Greg@epa.gov, (202) 564-0255

NOAA Spokespeople:
- Joelle Gore, Acting Division Chief, Stewardship Division, NOS/OCM
- Jeff Payne, Acting Director, Office for Coastal Management, NOS

EPA Spokespeople:
- Lynda Hall, Chief, Nonpoint Source Control Branch, EPA HQ
- Christine Psyk, Associate Director, Office of Water and Watersheds, EPA R10
- Dennis McLerran, Regional Administrator, EPA R10

Key Messages:
- Preventing and reducing coastal nonpoint source pollution, as the Coastal Nonpoint Program is designed to do, is very important to NOAA and EPA. Nonpoint source pollution is the most significant remaining water quality issue in Oregon.

- NOAA and EPA are jointly issuing a Federal Register Notice announcing our determination ~~final decision finding~~ that Oregon has failed to submit a fully approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program.

- In December 2013, NOAA and EPA announced our intent to find that Oregon has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program in the Federal Register for a 90-day public comment period. The federal agencies carefully considered all public comments received as well as additional information from the state provided in support of its program during the public comment period prior to making this final determination about Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program.

- Finding that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable coastal nonpoint program means NOAA will withhold 30% of the funding it awards the state under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act which supports implementation of the state's coastal management program. EPA will also withhold 30% of the funding it awards under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act which supports implementation of the state's nonpoint source program. NOAA and EPA will begin withholding funds on July 1, 2015, with the start of the state's FY 2015 federal awards. Depending on appropriations levels, we anticipate the total amount of funds withheld for FY 2015 would be around $1.2 million (roughly $600K from each program).

- NOAA and EPA recognize the complexities and political challenges Oregon faces in developing a fully approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program. We have worked closely with the

state to help it address the conditions on its program and are committed to work as partners with the state to help it meet its challenges so that the state can achieve a fully approved program and have full funding restored for its coastal zone management and nonpoint source programs.

Additional Messages:

- Coastal states that participate in the National Coastal Zone Management Program are required under the Coastal Zone Management Act to develop a Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program (or Coastal Nonpoint Program) that describes the programs and enforceable mechanisms they will use to implement a suite of management measures to prevent and control polluted runoff in coastal waters. The management measures to prevent and control pollution that states are expected to adopt are described in EPA and NOAA guidance.
- Oregon is a leader in coastal management and we hope it can be a leader in protecting coastal water quality from nonpoint source pollution, too.
- Oregon has made significant progress on meeting many of its Coastal Nonpoint Program requirements but NOAA and EPA still find that the state has not satisfied all requirements related to forestry. Specifically the state still needs to develop measures that: 1) protect small and medium sized fish bearing streams and non-fish bearing streams, 2) protect landslide prone areas, 3) address runoff from legacy forest roads built prior to modern construction and drainage requirements, and 4) protect non-fish bearing streams during the aerial application of herbicides.
- The December 2013 proposed findings also proposed to find that Oregon still had not fully met the coastal nonpoint program requirements for new development and septic systems. However, the state provided additional information in March that NOAA and EPA now believe the state has satisfied those management measures and they are no longer a basis for finding that the state has failed to submit an approvable program.
- The December 2013 proposed findings also invited public comment on the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs for meeting the coastal nonpoint program requirements. Because NOAA and EPA did not propose a specific decision on the agriculture components, the federal agencies are not using agriculture as a basis for the decision today.
- NOAA and EPA appreciate the comments received regarding Oregon's agriculture programs and will carefully consider them as the agencies continue to work with Oregon to develop a fully approved coastal nonpoint program. When NOAA and EPA are ready to propose a specific decision regarding the agriculture aspects of Oregon's program, the public will have another opportunity to comment on that proposed decision.

Plan Summary and Schedule:

- Internal NOAA briefings
    - NOS AA/DAA brief—*TBD (December)*
    - NOAA OGC brief- *TBD (December)*
    - NOAA Downtown Leadership brief?-*TBD (December or early January)*
- Pre-coordination on FRN/Rollout between EPA and NOAA/OCM (on-going)

Prepared by: ACastellan (OCM)
Reviewed by:

- *Two weeks prior to publication of the Final Decision* - NOAA-EPA send a note to the Administration in their Cabinet reports to alert them of this precedent setting decision (for NOAA this is the White House and Secretary's Weekly Report).
- *Two weeks prior to publication of Final Decision* – NOAA drafts press release and send to EPA/NMFS for review (Sherman)
- *January 10:* NOAA OLIA contacts relevant Oregon offices and committees to offer a briefing (Dukes)
- *January 15:* EPA/NOAA Rollout Coordination Call
- *January 30:* NOAA submits Final Decision to Federal Register for publication (Nikki Ndubisi, NOS)
- *Target January 29:* EPA provide draft of press release to OR
- *January 29:* Call or briefing with interested Congressional staff (Dukes lead, involves rollout spokespeople and others).
- *Target January 29*: OLIA notifies relevant Committee staff and staff in appropriate Member offices of final decision and that FRN and press release will be available publicly (Dukes).
- *Target January 29*: EPA and NOAA give respective state partners verbal heads-up about forthcoming decision (Pysk and Gore/Castellan).
- *January 30*: EPA (Pysk) send Oregon official letter and decision document informing them of final decision
- *January 30:* GCOC notifies DOJ that state/NWEA have been informed of final decision and FRN will be posted; DOJ notifies plaintiff (Dillen).
- *Target February 4:* Notice of Final Decision published in Federal Register.
- *Target February 4*: NOAA posts final decision on OCM website (Castellan) and issues press release (Sherman).

Materials:

- General talking points (above)
- Call List for NOAA and EPA (email maintained)
- Press release (to be developed, NOS Public Affairs coordinating with EPA and NMFS)
- Final decision document will be posted on http://coast.noaa.gov/czm/pollutioncontrol/
- Response to Comments on Proposed Decision to be posted on http://coast.noaa.gov/czm/pollutioncontrol/
- Docket of documents NOAA and EPA used in making decision (to be posted on OCM's website with proposed decision)
- A message will be posted on the NOAA Office for Coastal Management (OCM) website under "Highlights" (http://coast.noaa.gov/) with a link to the press release.
- Federal Register Notice
- Cover letter to state informing them of decision

Background on Coastal Nonpoint Program:

In 1990, Congress established the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program (Coastal Nonpoint Program) under Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments

(CZARA) to encourage better coordination between state coastal zone managers and water quality experts to reduce polluted runoff in the coastal zone. Poor water quality is a result of what we do to the water, as well as what we do on the land. Therefore, shared responsibilities are needed for managing coastal water quality between state coastal zone management agencies (which make land use decisions) and water quality agencies which deal directly with the quality of our coastal waters). All coastal and Great Lakes states and territories that participate in the National Coastal Zone Management Program under the Coastal Zone Management Act are required to develop coastal nonpoint programs.

NOAA and EPA jointly administer the Coastal Nonpoint Program. The program establishes a set of management measures for states to use in controlling polluted runoff from six main sources: forestry, agriculture, urban areas, marinas, hydromodification, and wetlands and riparian areas. These measures must be backed by enforceable state policies and mechanisms to ensure their implementation.

Background on Decision on Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program:
Per a settlement agreement with the Northwest Environmental Advocates from a 2009 lawsuit, NOAA and EPA originally needed to make a final decision regarding the approvability of Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program by May 15, 2014, which was extended to January 30, 2015, with agreement of the plaintiff. Prior to making a final decision, NOAA and EPA also needed to announce in the Federal Register, the agencies' intent to fully approve or disapprove Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program. On December 20, 2013, NOAA and EPA published a Federal Register Notice announcing the agencies' intent to find that Oregon has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program under CZARA for a 90-day public comment period. NOAA and EPA conditionally approved Oregon's program in 1998 and worked closely with the state to address nearly all of its 40 original conditions. Due to numerous challenges, the state has not yet been able to satisfactorily address all remaining program requirements. Specifically, NOAA and EPA have found that the state has failed to satisfy the condition placed on its program requiring the state to adopt additional management measures to address ~~polluted runoff~~ pollutants from forestry operations.

NOAA and EPA received 85 comments on the intended decision. The majority of commenters (46) supported the proposed decision. Nine commenters opposed the decision because they did not want penalties imposed (but agreed that state needed to do more to protect water quality). Fifteen commenters opposed the decision because they felt the state met its CZARA requirements. Another 15 commenters did not offer a specific opinion on the proposed decision although the majority of these commenters believed the state needed to do more to protect coastal water quality. NOAA and EPA carefully considered all public comments and additional information the state submitted in support of its program before making a final decision about the approvability of the state's program. NOAA OCM is coordinating closely with NOAA General Counsel (GC) and NMFS Northwest Region (given salmon issues) on this decision. EPA is also working closely with the agency's Office of Pesticides on the pesticides related elements.

Prepared by: ACastellan (OCM)
Reviewed by:

In their December 2013 proposed finding on Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program, NOAA and EPA also found that the state had failed to fully meet the CZARA requirements for new development and septic systems. However, the state provided additional information about continued improvements it's made to those programs in March 2014. Given the new information provided and the progress the state has made to improve its management of nonpoint source pollution from new development and septic systems, NOAA and EPA no longer believe those management measures are ~~a basis~~ bases for finding that the state has failed to submit an approvable program.

NOAA and EPA's final decision finding that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program is precedent setting. As a result of this finding, CZARA requires NOAA to withhold 30 percent of funding it awards the Oregon under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) which supports implementation of the state's coastal management program. CZARA also requires EPA to withhold 30 percent of the funding it awards the state under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) which supports the state's nonpoint source program, including TMDL development. Although dependent on final FY 2015 appropriations, the total amount of withheld funds will likely be around $1.2 million (roughly $600K from each program). NOAA and EPA will begin withholding funds at the start of the state's FY 2015 awards on July 1, 2015. NOAA and EPA will continue to withhold 30 percent of the state's funding from Section 306 of the CZMA and Section 319 of the CWA, respectively, each year the state continues to not have a fully approved coastal nonpoint program. This decision may have ramifications for 11 other states with conditionally approved coastal nonpoint programs (Alabama, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, Texas, and Washington).

Questions and Answers (supplement to Key Messages):

QUESTION: Under what authority is NOAA and EPA undertaking this action?
ANSWER: Congress created the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program under Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments. Section 6217 authorizes NOAA and EPA to approve ~~and~~ or disapprove a state's coastal nonpoint program. CZARA also requires the federal agencies to withhold funding when they find that a state has failed to submit an approvable program.

QUESTION: What is driving the timing of this decision?
ANSWER: The Northwest Environmental Advocates (NWEA) sued NOAA and EPA in 2009 challenging the agencies' joint administration of Oregon's coastal nonpoint program. The plaintiff's primary argument was that NOAA and EPA failed to take a final action on the approval (without conditions) or disapproval of Oregon's coastal nonpoint program, as well as to withhold funds from Oregon for not having a fully approved program. NOAA and EPA settled the lawsuit in 2010 and agreed to announce in the Federal Register our intent to fully approve

or disapprove Oregon's program by November 15, 2013, and to make a final decision on the approvability of the program by May 15, 2014. NOAA and EPA negotiated an extension of the May deadline to January 30, 2015.

QUESTION: What are the consequences of this decision?
ANSWER: When NOAA and EPA find that a state has failed to submit a fully approvable program, CZARA requires NOAA to withhold 30% of the state's Coastal Zone Management Act Section 306 funding that supports implementation of the state's coastal management program. CZARA also requires EPA to withhold 30% of the state's Clean Water Act Section 319 funding that supports implementation of the state's nonpoint source management program. Depending on FY 2015 appropriations, the total amount of withheld funds will likely be around $1.2 million (roughly $600K from each program). NOAA and EPA will begin withholding funds at the start of the state's FY 2015 awards on July 1, 2015. Each year, the federal agencies will continue to withhold 30% of the funding allocated to these two programs until Oregon has a fully approved coastal nonpoint program.

QUESTION: Does "disapproving" Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program mean that the Federal Government will now take over administration of the program for the state like EPA can take over issuing a state's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulatory permit program if EPA finds a state is not doing an adequate job administering the NPDES program?
ANSWER: No. Under CZARA, NOAA and EPA do not have the authority to take over administering a state's coastal nonpoint program. When NOAA and EPA find that a state has failed to submit an approval program, the only action the Federal Government must take is to withhold funding from the state under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act and Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. The state remains responsible for administering and continuing to develop its coastal nonpoint program.

QUESTION: How can NOAA and EPA expect Oregon to be able to develop a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program when they withhold funding for two important state programs that work to protect and restore water quality and salmon habitat?
ANSWER: We recognize the financial penalties could make it more difficult for Oregon to maintain the same level of effort on key programs that help improve water quality and protect salmon habitat, such as the state's coastal management, TMDL, and nonpoint source programs. However, the penalty provision in CZARA was designed to provide a financial disincentive to states to encourage them to develop fully approvable coastal nonpoint programs to provide better protection for coastal water quality. NOAA and EPA are committed to continuing to work with Oregon to develop a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program so that full funding can be restored as soon as possible.

QUESTION: If water quality trends in the state are improving, why are NOAA and EPA proposing to disapprove Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program?

ANSWER: NOAA and EPA agree that in many areas, the state is making progress to improve water quality and should be recognized for those efforts. However, despite this progress, significant impairments still exist and more needs to be done to satisfy coastal nonpoint program requirements. The goal of the Coastal Nonpoint Program is to ensure management measures are in place to achieve and maintain water quality standards and protect designated uses in coastal watersheds, which are particularly vital to salmon.

There are still many areas along Oregon's coast that are not achieving water quality standards or ~~achieving~~ fully supporting designated uses. Studies undertaken by the State of Oregon, neighboring states, and the broader science community have clearly demonstrated the need for improving protections around small and medium sized streams and landslide prone areas, and addressing runoff impacts from logging roads built under older and less protective standards, in order to protect and recover salmon and trout species. Neighboring coastal states have already adopted improved forestry protection measures to address these three areas. The Board of Forestry has formally acknowledged that the current Oregon Forest Practices Act riparian protection requirements are causing significant degradation of resources. Based on the latest ODF/DEQ study designed to test Oregon Forest Practices Act buffers for small and medium fish streams, over 40% of the streams evaluated failed to meet the State's water quality standard criteria developed to ensure successful salmonid spawning and rearing.

QUESTION: What benchmarks does Oregon need to meet to receive full approval for its Coastal Nonpoint Program? Do NOAA and EPA consider past practice and how effectively programs are being implemented and when making this decision?
ANSWER: To receive full approval, CZARA states that each coastal nonpoint program must "provide for the implementation, at a minimum, of management measures in conformity with the guidance published under section (g)…." (6217(b)) and meet other requirements in the Coastal Nonpoint Program guidance (see www.epa.gov/nps/czara for EPA's 6217(g) technical guidance and for NOAA and EPA's programmatic guidance: http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/docs/6217progguidance.pdf). For CZARA approval, NOAA and EPA cannot consider how well a state is enforcing a particular program, only whether or not the state has processes in place to implement the CZARA 6217(g) measures.

QUESTION: What does Oregon need to do to obtain full approval for its coastal nonpoint program?
ANSWER: Oregon needs to adopt additional management measures for forestry to protect small and medium fish bearing streams and non-fish bearing streams, add protections for landslide prone areas, ensure that legacy forest roads are not a continuing source of sediment that ends up in rivers and streams, and improve protection for non-fish bearing streams during the aerial application of pesticides.

In addition, NOAA and EPA are continuing to consider the public comment received about the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs for meeting CZARA requirements and protecting

water quality. While not a basis for this decision, after further evaluation, there may be more that the state needs to do to improve its agriculture programs as well. NOAA and EPA plan to provide the state additional feedback on its agriculture programs soon and are committed to working with the state to ensure the programs are adequate for meeting CZARA requirements, if needed.

QUESTION: NOAA and EPA site Oregon's failure to adopt additional management measures to address some forestry-related nonpoint source issues as the reason the agencies have found that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable coastal nonpoint program. Does that mean that Oregon only needs to make improvements to its forestry practices to gain full approval?
ANSWER: Not necessarily. While NOAA and EPA are only basing this decision on Oregon's failure to satisfy the additional management measures for forestry condition, that does not necessarily mean Oregon has fully met all other CZARA program requirements and that no further action will be needed to address other CZARA management measures. While NOAA and EPA had previously given Oregon "interim" approvals for many of the other CZARA management measures, we noted that these were only preliminary decisions pending public comment. If and when NOAA and EPA believe the state has fully met all its CZARA requirements, the public will be provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed decision to fully approve the state's coastal nonpoint program as well as the rationale for such a decision. Information the public provides during the comment period may cause NOAA and EPA to reassess an earlier "interim" decision or go back to the state for additional clarification.

QUESTION: Have EPA and NOAA ever found that a state has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program?
ANSWER: No. This is the first time EPA and NOAA have found that a state has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program. The agencies prefer to work with states to build programs that are approvable. However, NOAA and EPA were sued for failing to issue a final approval or disapproval decision for Oregon's program. The Settlement Agreement for that lawsuit required EPA and NOAA to make a final decision regarding Oregon's program by May 15, 2014 (subsequently extended to January 30, 2015, with agreement from the plaintiff). As a result, the agencies needed to act and do not have the flexibility they might have without court-required deadlines.

QUESTION: Why is Oregon the first state NOAA and EPA have found that has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program when other coastal states, such as New Jersey, for example, would appear to have much dirtier water than Oregon?
ANSWER: The Northwest Environmental Advocates sued NOAA and EPA in 2009 for failing to make a final decision regarding the approvability of Oregon's coastal nonpoint program. As part of the settlement agreement with NWEA, NOAA and EPA agreed to make a final determination about Oregon's program by May 15, 2014 (extended to January 30, 2015 with agreement from NWEA). Therefore, the agencies had to act and make a final decision regarding Oregon's program. Because the state has clearly not satisfied all conditions on its program, NOAA and EPA found that the state had failed to submit a fully approvable program.

Historically, NOAA and EPA have preferred to work with states to build programs that are approvable rather than make a final finding that a state has failed to submit an approvable program which also requires the agencies to withhold funding from the state's coastal management and nonpoint source programs. To receive full approval, CZARA states that each coastal nonpoint program must "provide for the implementation, at a minimum, of management measures in conformity with the guidance published under section (g)….". Therefore, as long as a state has programs in place, backed by enforceable authorities, that provide for the implementation of the CZARA management measures, a program is considered approved under CZARA. The state may have some shortfalls in enforcing some of their programs which could lead to continued water quality impairments but enforcement issues are not considered for CZARA approval.

QUESTION: Is Oregon being held to a higher bar than other states for Coastal Nonpoint Program approval?
ANSWER: No, Oregon is not being held to a higher bar for approval. The guidance that is used to evaluate and make judgments about Oregon's program is the same that is used to evaluate every other states' program. However, Oregon is the only state where NOAA and EPA have been sued over the agencies' ability to conditionally approve a state's Coastal Nonpoint Program. That lawsuit was settled and EPA and NOAA entered into a settlement agreement with the plaintiff. The settlement agreement required EPA and NOAA to take a final action to either approve or disapprove the state's program by May 15, 2014 (subsequently extended to January 30, 2015, with agreement from the plaintiff). If there was no Settlement Agreement, the agencies would not be compelled to make a determination by a specific date.

QUESTION: Some of the public comments, including the State, claim that NOAA and EPA are exceeding their authority under CZARA by requiring the state to develop additional management measures. They believe that according to CZARA guidance, only states have the ability to adopt additional management measures. Can you explain why NOAA and EPA have a different interpretation?
ANSWER: The authority for determining the need for additional management measures does not reside exclusively with the state as some, including the state, have asserted. NOAA and EPA also have the authority to impose additional management measures. CZARA requires that a state program, among other things, provide for "[t]he implementation and continuing revision from time-to-time of additional management measures . . ." 16 U.S.C. 1445b(b)(3). The Act is not explicit about <u>who</u> is to impose these additional measures (it is drafted in the passive voice); however, when read as a whole, the statute is clear that the agencies are intended to identify when management measures are necessary, and to provide technical guidance about what those measure should include. States may have flexibility to design the specific management measures necessary to meet water quality standards, but they do not have exclusive authority to identify when additional management measures are required.

The legislative history supports this interpretation. An early version of the bill that would later become CZARA, provided that the entity responsible for determining when an additional management measure is necessary is "the [state's] coastal management agency, in cooperation with the State water quality authorities and other State or local authorities, as appropriate . . . ."[1] This language – giving states the authority to determine when additional measures were needed – was stricken from the bill prior to enactment, suggesting Congress intended to take a different approach. The language enacted is consistent with the overall design of CZARA –the agencies identify when management measures are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards, and the state then designs measures to meet this compliance benchmark.

QUESTION: In the December 20, 2013, proposed decision, NOAA and EPA solicited public comment on the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs for meeting CZARA requirements. However, this final decision does not make a finding on the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs, why not?
ANSWER: Oregon's coastal nonpoint program is "disapproved" if the state fails to meet just one remaining condition on its program. NOAA and EPA found that there was sufficient basis to find that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable program given the state's lack of additional management measures for forestry. In addition, in the December 2013 proposed decision document, NOAA and EPA did not propose a specific decision or provide a rationale for that decision for public comment. Therefore, before the federal agencies can make a final decision on the approvability of the agriculture elements of Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program, the public would need to be given an opportunity to comment on a specific proposed decision and rationale for that decision.

NOAA and EPA are carefully considering the comments that were submitted regarding agriculture and plan to provide the state an updated assessment of the agriculture components of its coastal nonpoint program in the near future. If at that time, based on comments received and NOAA and EPA's current understanding of Oregon's agriculture programs, NOAA and EPA believe the state has not fully satisfied the CZARA agriculture requirements, the federal agencies are committed to working with the state to address any deficiencies that may be found. Also, the public will have another opportunity to comment on NOAA and EPA's intended decision regarding the CZARA agriculture elements before the federal agencies make a final decision.

QUESTION: What are the specific concerns you are hearing related to agriculture?
ANSWER: Although the federal agencies initially found that the State's agriculture programs enabled the it to satisfy the agriculture condition on its coastal nonpoint program, there is concern that water quality impairments from agriculture activities within the coastal nonpoint management area are widespread and that the State's programs and policies may not adequately meet the 6217(g) management measures for agriculture to protect coastal waters. For example, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Services' recent listings for coho salmon and

[1] 136 Cong. Rec. H8068-01 (Sept. 26, 1990), 1990 WL 148732 at *64.

draft recovery plans (both under the Endangered Species Act) find that insufficient riparian buffers around agriculture activities are one of the contributors to the salmon's decline.

Some specific concerns with the State's agriculture program that have been brought to the federal agencies' attention and may influence the final decision of whether or not the State has satisfied the 6217(g) agriculture management measure requirements and the conditions placed on its program include the following:

- Enforcement is limited and largely complaint-driven; it is unclear what enforcement actions have been taken in the coastal nonpoint management area and what improvements resulted from those actions.
- The AWQMA plan rules are general and do not include specific requirements for implementing the plan recommendations, such as specific buffer requirements to adequately protect water quality and fish habitat.
- AWQMA planning has focused primarily on impaired areas when the focus should be on both protection and restoration.
- The State does not administer a formalized process to track implementation and effectiveness of AWQMA plans.
- AWQMA planning and enforcement does not address "legacy" issues created by agriculture activities that are no longer occurring.

For Official Use Only – Pre-decisional Deliberative Information – Not for Public Release

ROLL OUT PLAN

Release of Federal Register Notice (FRN) Announcing NOAA and EPA's Final Decision Finding that Oregon Has Failed to Submit an Approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program

Action: Release of Federal Register Notice (FRN) Announcing NOAA and EPA's ~~Final Decision Finding~~ determination that Oregon Has Failed to Submit an Approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program

Date: To comply with a settlement agreement with the Northwest Environmental Advocates, on January 30, 2015, NOAA and EPA will notify the state of our determination ~~final decision~~. We will also inform the plaintiff and submit an FRN announcing the decision to the Office of the Federal Register for publication in the Federal Register 3-4 business days later.

Roll out lead:
Allison Castellan, NOS/OCM, (301) 563-1125 (NOAA/NOS lead for action)
Don Waye, EPA/OWOW (202) 566-1170
Jayne Carlin, EPA R10/OWW (206) 553-8512

NOAA Roll out team:

- National Ocean Service:
  - Allison Castellan, NOS/OCM (301) 563-1125 (lead for action)
  - Joelle Gore, NOS/OCM (301) 563-1177
  - Donna McCaskill, NOS/OCM Communications (843) 740-1272
  - Lindsey C. Williams, NOS Policy/Leg (301) 713-3070 x 115
- National Marine Fisheries Service
  - Kim Kratz, NMFS/WCR/WCRO/AOD (503) 231-2155
- NOAA Communications/ Public Affairs
  - @NOS - Ben Sherman (lead), Keeley Belva, (back-up), (301) 713-3066
  - @NMFS – Katherine Cheney, (503) 231-6730
- NOAA Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
  - Michael Dukes (202) 482-5597 (NOS portfolio)
  - Linda Belton (202) 482-5447 (Intergovernmental)
  - Christina Durham (202) 482-5935 (NFMS portfolio)
- NOAA PCO (NOS) – Adria Schneck-Scott (202) 482-1281
- NOAA General Counsel
  - Jeff Dillen (301) 713-7382

EPA Rollout team

- OWOW
  - Don Waye, EPA/OWOW (202) 566-1170
  - Lynda Hall, EPA/OWOW (202) 566-1210
  - Christine Psyk, EPA R10/OWW (206) 553-1906
  - Jayne Carlin, EPA R10/OWW (206) 553-8512

Prepared by: ACastellan (OCM)
Reviewed by:

- EPA Communications/Public Affairs
  - Marianne Holsman (206) 553-1237 (EPA NW)
- EPA Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
  - Sven-Erik Kaiser, Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov, (202) 566-2753
  - Greg Spraul, Spraul.Greg@epa.gov, (202) 564-0255

NOAA Spokespeople:
- Joelle Gore, Acting Division Chief, Stewardship Division, NOS/OCM
- Jeff Payne, Acting Director, Office for Coastal Management, NOS

EPA Spokespeople:
- Lynda Hall, Chief, Nonpoint Source Control Branch, EPA HQ
- Christine Psyk, Associate Director, Office of Water and Watersheds, EPA R10
- Dennis McLerran, Regional Administrator, EPA R10

Key Messages:
- Preventing and reducing coastal nonpoint source pollution, as the Coastal Nonpoint Program is designed to do, is very important to NOAA and EPA. Nonpoint source pollution is the most significant remaining water quality issue in Oregon.

- NOAA and EPA are jointly issuing a Federal Register Notice announcing our determination ~~final decision finding~~ that Oregon has failed to submit a fully approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program.

- In December 2013, NOAA and EPA announced our intent to find that Oregon has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program in the Federal Register for a 90-day public comment period. The federal agencies carefully considered all public comments received as well as additional information from the state provided in support of its program during the public comment period prior to making this final determination about Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program.

- Finding that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable coastal nonpoint program means NOAA will withhold 30% of the funding it awards the state under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act which supports implementation of the state's coastal management program. EPA will also withhold 30% of the funding it awards under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act which supports implementation of the state's nonpoint source program. NOAA and EPA will begin withholding funds on July 1, 2015, with the start of the state's FY 2015 federal awards. Depending on appropriations levels, we anticipate the total amount of funds withheld for FY 2015 would be around $1.2 million (roughly $600K from each program).

Comment [AC1]: Adjust with we get an FY15 budget before release.

- NOAA and EPA recognize the complexities and political challenges Oregon faces in developing a fully approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program. We have worked closely with the

ED468JC-000025623 EPA-6822_041691

state to help it address the conditions on its program and are committed to work as partners with the state to help it meet its challenges so that the state can achieve a fully approved program and have full funding restored for its coastal zone management and nonpoint source programs.

Additional Messages:

- Coastal states that participate in the National Coastal Zone Management Program are required under the Coastal Zone Management Act to develop a Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program (or Coastal Nonpoint Program) that describes the programs and enforceable mechanisms they will use to implement a suite of management measures to prevent and control polluted runoff in coastal waters. The management measures to prevent and control pollution that states are expected to adopt are described in EPA and NOAA guidance.
- Oregon is a leader in coastal management and we hope it can be a leader in protecting coastal water quality from nonpoint source pollution, too.
- Oregon has made significant progress on meeting many of its Coastal Nonpoint Program requirements but NOAA and EPA still find that the state has not satisfied all requirements related to forestry. Specifically the state still needs to develop measures that: 1) protect small and medium sized fish bearing streams and non-fish bearing streams, 2) protect landslide prone areas, 3) address runoff from legacy forest roads built prior to modern construction and drainage requirements, and 4) protect non-fish bearing streams during the aerial application of herbicides.
- The December 2013 proposed findings also proposed to find that Oregon still had not fully met the coastal nonpoint program requirements for new development and septic systems. However, the state provided additional information in March that NOAA and EPA now believe the state has satisfied those management measures and they are no longer a basis for finding that the state has failed to submit an approvable program.
- The December 2013 proposed findings also invited public comment on the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs for meeting the coastal nonpoint program requirements. Because NOAA and EPA did not propose a specific decision on the agriculture components, the federal agencies are not using agriculture as a basis for the decision today.
- NOAA and EPA appreciate the comments received regarding Oregon's agriculture programs and will carefully consider them as the agencies continue to work with Oregon to develop a fully approved coastal nonpoint program. When NOAA and EPA are ready to propose a specific decision regarding the agriculture aspects of Oregon's program, the public will have another opportunity to comment on that proposed decision.

Plan Summary and Schedule:

- Internal NOAA briefings
  - NOS AA/DAA brief—*TBD (December)*
  - NOAA OGC brief- *TBD (December)*
  - NOAA Downtown Leadership brief?-*TBD (December or early January)*
- Pre-coordination on FRN/Rollout between EPA and NOAA/OCM (on-going)

Prepared by: ACastellan (OCM)
Reviewed by:

- *Two weeks prior to publication of the Final Decision* - NOAA-EPA send a note to the Administration in their Cabinet reports to alert them of this precedent setting decision (for NOAA this is the White House and Secretary's Weekly Report).
- *Two weeks prior to publication of Final Decision* – NOAA drafts press release and send to EPA/NMFS for review (Sherman)
- *January 10:* NOAA OLIA contacts relevant Oregon offices and committees to offer a briefing (Dukes)
- *January 15:* EPA/NOAA Rollout Coordination Call
- *January 30:* NOAA submits Final Decision to Federal Register for publication (Nikki Ndubisi, NOS)
- *Target January 29:* EPA provide draft of press release to OR
- *January 29:* Call or briefing with interested Congressional staff (Dukes lead, involves rollout spokespeople and others).
- *Target January 29*: OLIA notifies relevant Committee staff and staff in appropriate Member offices of final decision and that FRN and press release will be available publicly (Dukes).
- *Target January 29*: EPA and NOAA give respective state partners verbal heads-up about forthcoming decision (Pysk and Gore/Castellan).
- *January 30*: EPA (Pysk) send Oregon official letter and decision document informing them of final decision
- *January 30:* GCOC notifies DOJ that state/NWEA have been informed of final decision and FRN will be posted; DOJ notifies plaintiff (Dillen).
- *Target February 4:* Notice of Final Decision published in Federal Register.
- *Target February 4*: NOAA posts final decision on OCM website (Castellan) and issues press release (Sherman).

Comment [AC2]: Program team has discussed sending FR for publication on Jan. 30th but for press release, do we need public announcement by 30th? May need to move up FRN publication so it appears on Jan. 30th?

Comment [AC3]: Do we still want to do this given experience last time or should we just give some state staff a verbal heads up?

Comment [AC4]: Move up to Jan. 30th?

Comment [AC5]: Move up?

Materials:

- General talking points (above)
- Call List for NOAA and EPA (email maintained)
- Press release (to be developed, NOS Public Affairs coordinating with EPA and NMFS)
- Final decision document will be posted on http://coast.noaa.gov/czm/pollutioncontrol/
- Response to Comments on Proposed Decision to be posted on http://coast.noaa.gov/czm/pollutioncontrol/
- Docket of documents NOAA and EPA used in making decision (to be posted on OCM's website with proposed decision)
- A message will be posted on the NOAA Office for Coastal Management (OCM) website under "Highlights" (http://coast.noaa.gov/) with a link to the press release.
- Federal Register Notice
- Cover letter to state informing them of decision

Comment [AC6]: What additional documents do we need to add?

Comment [AC7]: Need to figure out if this is appropriate given new site.

Background on Coastal Nonpoint Program:

In 1990, Congress established the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program (Coastal Nonpoint Program) under Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments

(CZARA) to encourage better coordination between state coastal zone managers and water quality experts to reduce polluted runoff in the coastal zone. Poor water quality is a result of what we do to the water, as well as what we do on the land. Therefore, shared responsibilities are needed for managing coastal water quality between state coastal zone management agencies (which make land use decisions) and water quality agencies which deal directly with the quality of our coastal waters). All coastal and Great Lakes states and territories that participate in the National Coastal Zone Management Program under the Coastal Zone Management Act are required to develop coastal nonpoint programs.

NOAA and EPA jointly administer the Coastal Nonpoint Program. The program establishes a set of management measures for states to use in controlling polluted runoff from six main sources: forestry, agriculture, urban areas, marinas, hydromodification, and wetlands and riparian areas. These measures must be backed by enforceable state policies and mechanisms to ensure their implementation.

Background on Decision on Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program:
Per a settlement agreement with the Northwest Environmental Advocates from a 2009 lawsuit, NOAA and EPA originally needed to make a final decision regarding the approvability of Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program by May 15, 2014, which was extended to January 30, 2015, with agreement of the plaintiff. Prior to making a final decision, NOAA and EPA also needed to announce in the Federal Register, the agencies' intent to fully approve or disapprove Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program. On December 20, 2013, NOAA and EPA published a Federal Register Notice announcing the agencies' intent to find that Oregon has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program under CZARA for a 90-day public comment period. NOAA and EPA conditionally approved Oregon's program in 1998 and worked closely with the state to address nearly all of its 40 original conditions. Due to numerous challenges, the state has not yet been able to satisfactorily address all remaining program requirements. Specifically, NOAA and EPA have found that the state has failed to satisfy the condition placed on its program requiring the state to adopt additional management measures to address ~~polluted runoff~~ pollutants from forestry operations.

Comment [HA8]: Suggest this change because "heat" is a pollutant and inadequate riparian areas do not protect water quality from increased heat/solar radiation, which may or may not be from runoff.

NOAA and EPA received 85 comments on the intended decision. The majority of commenters (46) supported the proposed decision. Nine commenters opposed the decision because they did not want penalties imposed (but agreed that state needed to do more to protect water quality). Fifteen commenters opposed the decision because they felt the state met its CZARA requirements. Another 15 commenters did not offer a specific opinion on the proposed decision although the majority of these commenters believed the state needed to do more to protect coastal water quality. NOAA and EPA carefully considered all public comments and additional information the state submitted in support of its program before making a final decision about the approvability of the state's program. NOAA OCM is coordinating closely with NOAA General Counsel (GC) and NMFS Northwest Region (given salmon issues) on this decision. EPA is also working closely with the agency's Office of Pesticides on the pesticides related elements.

Comment [HA9]: Do we need to spell out "OCM" ?

Prepared by: ACastellan (OCM)
Reviewed by:

In their December 2013 proposed finding on Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program, NOAA and EPA also found that the state had failed to fully meet the CZARA requirements for new development and septic systems. However, the state provided additional information about continued improvements it's made to those programs in March 2014. Given the new information provided and the progress the state has made to improve its management of nonpoint source pollution from new development and septic systems, NOAA and EPA no longer believe those management measures are ~~a basis~~ bases for finding that the state has failed to submit an approvable program.

NOAA and EPA's final decision finding that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable Coastal Nonpoint Program is precedent setting. As a result of this finding, CZARA requires NOAA to withhold 30 percent of funding it awards the Oregon under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) which supports implementation of the state's coastal management program. CZARA also requires EPA to withhold 30 percent of the funding it awards the state under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) which supports the state's nonpoint source program, including TMDL development. Although dependent on final FY 2015 appropriations, the total amount of withheld funds will likely be around $1.2 million (roughly $600K from each program). NOAA and EPA will begin withholding funds at the start of the state's FY 2015 awards on July 1, 2015. NOAA and EPA will continue to withhold 30 percent of the state's funding from Section 306 of the CZMA and Section 319 of the CWA, respectively, each year the state continues to not have a fully approved coastal nonpoint program. This decision may have ramifications for 11 other states with conditionally approved coastal nonpoint programs (Alabama, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, Texas, and Washington).

Questions and Answers (supplement to Key Messages):

QUESTION: Under what authority is NOAA and EPA undertaking this action?
ANSWER: Congress created the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program under Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments. Section 6217 authorizes NOAA and EPA to approve ~~and~~ or disapprove a state's coastal nonpoint program. CZARA also requires the federal agencies to withhold funding when they find that a state has failed to submit an approvable program.

Comment [HA10]: The "or" is consistent with the language in the answer to the next question.

QUESTION: What is driving the timing of this decision?
ANSWER: The Northwest Environmental Advocates (NWEA) sued NOAA and EPA in 2009 challenging the agencies' joint administration of Oregon's coastal nonpoint program. The plaintiff's primary argument was that NOAA and EPA failed to take a final action on the approval (without conditions) or disapproval of Oregon's coastal nonpoint program, as well as to withhold funds from Oregon for not having a fully approved program. NOAA and EPA settled the lawsuit in 2010 and agreed to announce in the Federal Register our intent to fully approve

or disapprove Oregon's program by November 15, 2013, and to make a final decision on the approvability of the program by May 15, 2014. NOAA and EPA negotiated an extension of the May deadline to January 30, 2015.

QUESTION: What are the consequences of this decision?
ANSWER: When NOAA and EPA find that a state has failed to submit a fully approvable program, CZARA requires NOAA to withhold 30% of the state's Coastal Zone Management Act Section 306 funding that supports implementation of the state's coastal management program. CZARA also requires EPA to withhold 30% of the state's Clean Water Act Section 319 funding that supports implementation of the state's nonpoint source management program. Depending on FY 2015 appropriations, the total amount of withheld funds will likely be around $1.2 million (roughly $600K from each program). NOAA and EPA will begin withholding funds at the start of the state's FY 2015 awards on July 1, 2015. Each year, the federal agencies will continue to withhold 30% of the funding allocated to these two programs until Oregon has a fully approved coastal nonpoint program.

QUESTION: Does "disapproving" Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program mean that the Federal Government will now take over administration of the program for the state like EPA can take over issuing a state's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulatory permit program if EPA finds a state is not doing an adequate job administering the NPDES program?
ANSWER: No. Under CZARA, NOAA and EPA do not have the authority to take over administering a state's coastal nonpoint program. When NOAA and EPA find that a state has failed to submit an approval program, the only action the Federal Government must take is to withhold funding from the state under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act and Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. The state remains responsible for administering and continuing to develop its coastal nonpoint program.

QUESTION: How can NOAA and EPA expect Oregon to be able to develop a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program when they withhold funding for two important state programs that work to protect and restore water quality and salmon habitat?
ANSWER: We recognize the financial penalties could make it more difficult for Oregon to maintain the same level of effort on key programs that help improve water quality and protect salmon habitat, such as the state's coastal management, TMDL, and nonpoint source programs. However, the penalty provision in CZARA was designed to provide a financial disincentive to states to encourage them to develop fully approvable coastal nonpoint programs to provide better protection for coastal water quality. NOAA and EPA are committed to continuing to work with Oregon to develop a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program so that full funding can be restored as soon as possible.

QUESTION: If water quality trends in the state are improving, why are NOAA and EPA proposing to disapprove Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program?

ANSWER: NOAA and EPA agree that in many areas, the state is making progress to improve water quality and should be recognized for those efforts. However, despite this progress, significant impairments still exist and more needs to be done to satisfy coastal nonpoint program requirements. The goal of the Coastal Nonpoint Program is to ensure management measures are in place to achieve and maintain water quality standards and protect designated uses in coastal watersheds, which are particularly vital to salmon.

There are still many areas along Oregon's coast that are not achieving water quality standards or ~~achieving~~ fully supporting designated uses. Studies undertaken by the State of Oregon, neighboring states, and the broader science community have clearly demonstrated the need for improving protections around small and medium sized streams and landslide prone areas, and addressing runoff impacts from logging roads built under older and less protective standards, in order to protect and recover salmon and trout species. Neighboring coastal states have already adopted improved forestry protection measures to address these three areas. The Board of Forestry has formally acknowledged that the current Oregon Forest Practices Act riparian protection requirements are causing significant degradation of resources. Based on the latest ODF/DEQ study designed to test Oregon Forest Practices Act buffers for small and medium fish streams, over 40% of the streams evaluated failed to meet the State's water quality standard criteria developed to ensure successful salmonid spawning and rearing.

Comment [HA11]: We may want to consider different language that is not as strong such as "are not supporting established water quality standards" Let'

QUESTION: What benchmarks does Oregon need to meet to receive full approval for its Coastal Nonpoint Program? Do NOAA and EPA consider past practice and how effectively programs are being implemented and when making this decision?
ANSWER: To receive full approval, CZARA states that each coastal nonpoint program must "provide for the implementation, at a minimum, of management measures in conformity with the guidance published under section (g)…." (6217(b)) and meet other requirements in the Coastal Nonpoint Program guidance (see www.epa.gov/nps/czara for EPA's 6217(g) technical guidance and for NOAA and EPA's programmatic guidance: http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/docs/6217progguidance.pdf). For CZARA approval, NOAA and EPA cannot consider how well a state is enforcing a particular program, only whether or not the state has processes in place to implement the CZARA 6217(g) measures.

QUESTION: What does Oregon need to do to obtain full approval for its coastal nonpoint program?
ANSWER: Oregon needs to adopt additional management measures for forestry to protect small and medium fish bearing streams and non-fish bearing streams, add protections for landslide prone areas, ensure that legacy forest roads are not a continuing source of sediment that ends up in rivers and streams, and improve protection for non-fish bearing streams during the aerial application of pesticides.

In addition, NOAA and EPA are continuing to consider the public comment received about the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs for meeting CZARA requirements and protecting

water quality. While not a basis for this decision, after further evaluation, there may be more that the state needs to do to improve its agriculture programs as well. NOAA and EPA plan to provide the state additional feedback on its agriculture programs soon and are committed to working with the state to ensure the programs are adequate for meeting CZARA requirements, if needed.

QUESTION: NOAA and EPA site Oregon's failure to adopt additional management measures to address some forestry-related nonpoint source issues as the reason the agencies have found that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable coastal nonpoint program. Does that mean that Oregon only needs to make improvements to its forestry practices to gain full approval?
ANSWER: Not necessarily. While NOAA and EPA are only basing this decision on Oregon's failure to satisfy the additional management measures for forestry condition, that does not necessarily mean Oregon has fully met all other CZARA program requirements and that no further action will be needed to address other CZARA management measures. While NOAA and EPA had previously given Oregon "interim" approvals for many of the other CZARA management measures, we noted that these were only preliminary decisions pending public comment. If and when NOAA and EPA believe the state has fully met all its CZARA requirements, the public will be provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed decision to fully approve the state's coastal nonpoint program as well as the rationale for such a decision. Information the public provides during the comment period may cause NOAA and EPA to reassess an earlier "interim" decision or go back to the state for additional clarification.

QUESTION: Have EPA and NOAA ever found that a state has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program?
ANSWER: No. This is the first time EPA and NOAA have found that a state has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program. The agencies prefer to work with states to build programs that are approvable. However, NOAA and EPA were sued for failing to issue a final approval or disapproval decision for Oregon's program. The Settlement Agreement for that lawsuit required EPA and NOAA to make a final decision regarding Oregon's program by May 15, 2014 (subsequently extended to January 30, 2015, with agreement from the plaintiff). As a result, the agencies needed to act and do not have the flexibility they might have without court-required deadlines.

QUESTION: Why is Oregon the first state NOAA and EPA have found that has failed to submit a fully approvable coastal nonpoint program when other coastal states, such as New Jersey, for example, would appear to have much dirtier water than Oregon?
ANSWER: The Northwest Environmental Advocates sued NOAA and EPA in 2009 for failing to make a final decision regarding the approvability of Oregon's coastal nonpoint program. As part of the settlement agreement with NWEA, NOAA and EPA agreed to make a final determination about Oregon's program by May 15, 2014 (extended to January 30, 2015 with agreement from NWEA). Therefore, the agencies had to act and make a final decision regarding Oregon's program. Because the state has clearly not satisfied all conditions on its program, NOAA and EPA found that the state had failed to submit a fully approvable program.

Historically, NOAA and EPA have preferred to work with states to build programs that are approvable rather than make a final finding that a state has failed to submit an approvable program which also requires the agencies to withhold funding from the state's coastal management and nonpoint source programs. To receive full approval, CZARA states that each coastal nonpoint program must "provide for the implementation, at a minimum, of management measures in conformity with the guidance published under section (g)....". Therefore, as long as a state has programs in place, backed by enforceable authorities, that provide for the implementation of the CZARA management measures, a program is considered approved under CZARA. The state may have some shortfalls in enforcing some of their programs which could lead to continued water quality impairments but enforcement issues are not considered for CZARA approval.

QUESTION: Is Oregon being held to a higher bar than other states for Coastal Nonpoint Program approval?
ANSWER: No, Oregon is not being held to a higher bar for approval. The guidance that is used to evaluate and make judgments about Oregon's program is the same that is used to evaluate every other states' program. However, Oregon is the only state where NOAA and EPA have been sued over the agencies' ability to conditionally approve a state's Coastal Nonpoint Program. That lawsuit was settled and EPA and NOAA entered into a settlement agreement with the plaintiff. The settlement agreement required EPA and NOAA to take a final action to either approve or disapprove the state's program by May 15, 2014 (subsequently extended to January 30, 2015, with agreement from the plaintiff). If there was no Settlement Agreement, the agencies would not be compelled to make a determination by a specific date.

QUESTION: Some of the public comments, including the State, claim that NOAA and EPA are exceeding their authority under CZARA by requiring the state to develop additional management measures. They believe that according to CZARA guidance, only states have the ability to adopt additional management measures. Can you explain why NOAA and EPA have a different interpretation?
ANSWER: The authority for determining the need for additional management measures does not reside exclusively with the state as some, including the state, have asserted. NOAA and EPA also have the authority to impose additional management measures. CZARA requires that a state program, among other things, provide for "[t]he implementation and continuing revision from time-to-time of additional management measures . . ." 16 U.S.C. 1445b(b)(3). The Act is not explicit about <u>who</u> is to impose these additional measures (it is drafted in the passive voice); however, when read as a whole, the statute is clear that the agencies are intended to identify when management measures are necessary, and to provide technical guidance about what those measure should include. States may have flexibility to design the specific management measures necessary to meet water quality standards, but they do not have exclusive authority to identify when additional management measures are required.

Prepared by: ACastellan (OCM)
Reviewed by:

The legislative history supports this interpretation. An early version of the bill that would later become CZARA, provided that the entity responsible for determining when an additional management measure is necessary is "the [state's] coastal management agency, in cooperation with the State water quality authorities and other State or local authorities, as appropriate . . ."[1] This language – giving states the authority to determine when additional measures were needed – was stricken from the bill prior to enactment, suggesting Congress intended to take a different approach. The language enacted is consistent with the overall design of CZARA –the agencies identify when management measures are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards, and the state then designs measures to meet this compliance benchmark.

QUESTION: In the December 20, 2013, proposed decision, NOAA and EPA solicited public comment on the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs for meeting CZARA requirements. However, this final decision does not make a finding on the adequacy of Oregon's agriculture programs, why not?
ANSWER: Oregon's coastal nonpoint program is "disapproved" if the state fails to meet just one remaining condition on its program. NOAA and EPA found that there was sufficient basis to find that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable program given the state's lack of additional management measures for forestry. In addition, in the December 2013 proposed decision document, NOAA and EPA did not propose a specific decision or provide a rationale for that decision for public comment. Therefore, before the federal agencies can make a final decision on the approvability of the agriculture elements of Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program, the public would need to be given an opportunity to comment on a specific proposed decision and rationale for that decision.

NOAA and EPA are carefully considering the comments that were submitted regarding agriculture and plan to provide the state an updated assessment of the agriculture components of its coastal nonpoint program in the near future. If at that time, based on comments received and NOAA and EPA's current understanding of Oregon's agriculture programs, NOAA and EPA believe the state has not fully satisfied the CZARA agriculture requirements, the federal agencies are committed to working with the state to address any deficiencies that may be found. Also, the public will have another opportunity to comment on NOAA and EPA's intended decision regarding the CZARA agriculture elements before the federal agencies make a final decision.

QUESTION: What are the specific concerns you are hearing related to agriculture?
ANSWER: Although the federal agencies initially found that the State's agriculture programs enabled the it to satisfy the agriculture condition on its coastal nonpoint program, there is concern that water quality impairments from agriculture activities within the coastal nonpoint management area are widespread and that the State's programs and policies may not adequately meet the 6217(g) management measures for agriculture to protect coastal waters. For example, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Services' recent listings for coho salmon and

[1] 136 Cong. Rec. H8068-01 (Sept. 26, 1990), 1990 WL 148732 at *64.

draft recovery plans (both under the Endangered Species Act) find that insufficient riparian buffers around agriculture activities are one of the contributors to the salmon's decline.

Some specific concerns with the State's agriculture program that have been brought to the federal agencies' attention and may influence the final decision of whether or not the State has satisfied the 6217(g) agriculture management measure requirements and the conditions placed on its program include the following:

- Enforcement is limited and largely complaint-driven; it is unclear what enforcement actions have been taken in the coastal nonpoint management area and what improvements resulted from those actions.
- The AWQMA plan rules are general and do not include specific requirements for implementing the plan recommendations, such as specific buffer requirements to adequately protect water quality and fish habitat.
- AWQMA planning has focused primarily on impaired areas when the focus should be on both protection and restoration.
- The State does not administer a formalized process to track implementation and effectiveness of AWQMA plans.
- AWQMA planning and enforcement does not address "legacy" issues created by agriculture activities that are no longer occurring.