


Walter McGuire  
CHAIRMAN  
Jose Mejia  
VICE-CHAIRMAN  
Gerald D. Secundy  
PRESIDENT  
William J. Quinn  
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER  
Steve Gross  
TREASURER  
Randy Fischback  
SECRETARY



# California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance

Public Cmt./Wrkshp (1/31 & 2/8)  
CEQA Wetlands Policy & Reg  
Deadline: 5/20/11 by 12 noon

100 Spear Street, Suite 805, San Francisco, CA 94105 • (415) 512-7890 • FAX (415) 512-7897

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Bob Antonoplis  
Joseph Avila  
William T. Bagley  
Robert Balgenorth  
Michael Barr  
Jack Bean  
Mike Beasley  
Ed Bedwell  
Joseph C. Bellas  
Russ Burns  
Steve Burns  
Ken Casarez  
John Chlilerni  
Michele Corash  
Tim Cremins  
Hal Dash  
Bill Devine  
Cesar Diaz  
Greg Feers  
Randy Fischback  
Steve Gross  
Michael Hertel  
Fred John  
James (J.P.) Jones  
Kenneth L. Khachigian  
John T. Knox  
Kristen Korbus  
Kirk Markwald  
Walter McGuire  
Sunne McPeak  
Jose Mejia  
Richard Morrison  
Cressey Nakagawa  
Joe Nufiez  
George Piantka  
Art Pulaski  
Mike Roos  
Lanny Schmid  
Gerald D. Secundy  
Dan Skopec  
Don Solem  
Katherine Strehl  
Steve Toth  
Minnie Tsuhezumi  
Victor Weisser

## CONSULTANTS

Kendra Daljogo  
THE GUALCO GROUP, INC.

Jackson R. Gualco  
THE GUALCO GROUP, INC.

Robert W. Lucas  
LUCAS ADVOCATES

Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown  
FOUNDING CHAIRMAN 1973

[www.cceeb.org](http://www.cceeb.org)

May 20, 2011

Ms. Jeanine Townsend  
Clerk to the Board  
State Water Resources Control Board  
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

VIA E-MAIL to [commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov)

RE: **Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report / Initial Study  
Checklist for the Wetland Area Protection Policy and Dredge and Fill  
Regulations.**

Dear State Water Resources Control Board Members:


The California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance (CCEEB) is a not-partisan, non-profit coalition of business, labor and public leaders that advances strategies for a strong economy and a healthy environment. On behalf of CCEEB, we want to thank you for this opportunity to comment.

These comments raise significant concerns in connection with the wetland definition proposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) in the Wetland Proposal. This proposal is centered on a new State definition for the delineation and regulation of wetland areas in California. If adopted, the proposed wetland definition, and its associated regulatory program would introduce significant complexity, cost, and confusion to the regulated community in California and negatively affect future investment and impact economic development in the State.

CCEEB provides the following comments on the State Board's Wetland Proposal:

### **The Wetland Proposal Fails to Justify Why Duplicative Regulation of Wetlands Subject to Federal Regulation is Justified or Necessary**

According to the EIR, the predominant purpose of the proposed wetland definition is to extend California's regulation of wetlands to "isolated" wetlands that the federal government may be unable to regulate under the Clean Water Act following the U.S. Supreme Court decisions in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (SWANCC)* and *Rapanos v. United States*. The EIR, however, provides no analysis of whether any change in the scope of federal jurisdiction attributable to the *Rapanos* or *SWANCC* decision resulted in any identifiable and material impact on the protection and health of wetlands in California. Since it has now been a decade since the Supreme Court's *SWANCC* decision, any resulting deleterious impact to State wetlands should be observable, but such analysis is not included in the EIR.



Furthermore, the EPA and USACE proposed new guidance on the scope of federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction over wetlands in a May 2, 2011 Federal Register notice that may obviate any arguable need for State regulation post-*Rapanos*. According to the Notice, the proposed guidance is intended to address the *SWANCC* and *Rapanos* decisions and, as a result of the new guidance, the "number of waters identified as protected by the Clean Water Act will increase compared to current practice ..." Rather than spend scarce State resources to develop and implement an expansive new regulatory program, the State Board should withdraw the proposed wetland definition and allow the federal government to finalize its new Clean Water guidance. Because the new guidance will likely resolve any possible issues driving the State Board's consideration of a State program to address wetlands following the *Rapanos* and *SWANCC* decisions, adoption of a costly, complex, and duplicative State regulatory program will likely be unnecessary.

For these reasons, CCEEB requests that the State Board reject any State definition of wetlands that departs from, or conflicts with the long-standing federal wetland delineation criteria. To the extent the State Board is determined to move forward with a State wetland definition, we ask that any action be delayed until after the EPA and USACE finalize a federal rule on this subject and until an evaluation of the basis and need for an additional, potentially duplicative State program is performed by the State Board. In such case, however, the State Board should withdraw the proposed State wetland definition pending finalization of the federal rule and further investigation because the regulatory uncertainty associated with the potential definition is already causing confusion among stakeholders and the potential for increased costs and delay in projects.

#### **Project Goes Beyond Filling the Gap**

The Initial Study (IS) states (pg. 2) that the "The Project ... is intended to fill the gaps currently caused by the separate federal and State regulations and programs by consolidating existing Water Board requirements in a coordinated framework. However, it appears to do more than just fill the gaps and actually expands the requirements that have been applied to federal and state waters.

The IS identifies two different project purposes – one that protects "all waters", including wetlands (pg. 2) and the other that protects "beneficial uses", including wetlands (pg 22). Not only are these two purposes different from one another, they also go above and beyond "filling the gap" that was left by *SWANCC* related to isolated waters.

#### **Proposed Wetland Definition Would Introduce Significant Regulatory Uncertainty by Creating a Dueling Definition to that Used by the Federal Government**

The most concerning aspect of the proposal is the rejection of the wetland definition used by the federal government for nearly twenty-five years for a new, alternative definition that would be used to define, delineate, and regulate "State" wetlands. In addition to extending State regulation to "isolated" wetlands, the proposed definition departs from the long-standing technical delineation criteria developed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in several critical aspects. The State Board's proposed definition would:

1. Extend regulation of State wetlands to areas that are barren and lack any vegetation, whereas the federal definition is limited to areas dominated by wetland species;

2. Abandon the hydric soil requirement used in the federal definition and instead define a wetland as including any saturated "substrate," whether consisting of soil or not; and

3. According to documents prepared by the Technical Advisory Team tasked by the State Board with developing the proposed wetland definition, the hydrology criteria would be satisfied under the proposed definition if an area is saturated for 7 days annually. The federal criteria, in contrast, generally require saturated conditions for at least 14 days annually.

The Project attempts to support the inclusion of riparian areas by identifying them in Table 2 as certain "isolated" waters that fell outside of the USACE jurisdiction as a result of the SWANCC decision. Typically, the USACE jurisdiction did not and does not extend to riparian (i.e., streamside) areas and this should be revised to reflect USACE practice.

The SWRCB has frequently referred to the "no net loss" objective in Governor Wilson's Executive Order W-59-93 ("Order") and the California Wetlands Conservation Policy ("Policy") as a fundamental basis for its development of the WRAPP. However, this "no net loss" objective is but one of three equally important objectives set forth in both this Order and Policy. Another express objective of the Order and Policy is to "reduce procedural complexity in the administration of State and Federal wetlands conservation programs." However, adopting a wetland definition inconsistent with the accepted federal approach for delineating wetlands will result in additional complication in an already complex regulatory-field, increase the burden and cost of regulatory compliance for private and public property owners, and reduce new investment in the State. As such, it would undermine the "reduce procedural complexity" objective in both the Order and Policy, which is not permitted by either directive. For example, two separate regulatory definitions would result in dueling definitions between the State and federal government, and require that property owners in California delineate State and federal wetlands separately on project sites.

### **The Wetland Proposal Does Not Adequately Explain Why Use of the Federal Wetland Definition is Not Feasible**

The proposed definition also departs from the specific direction given to staff by the State Board in 2008. In tasking staff with preparing a policy to protect State wetlands from dredge and fill activities, including consideration of a State wetland definition, the State Board directed the Development Team to:

*Develop and bring forward for State Water Board consideration: a wetland definition that would reliably define the diverse array of California wetlands based on the United States Army Corps of Engineers' wetland delineation methods to the extent feasible ...*

State Board Resolution 2008-0026 - Pursuant to Resolution 2008-0026, staff was directed not to depart from the existing federal definition of wetlands *unless it was determined that it was not feasible to use it*. The EIR, however provides no meaningful discussion justifying the abandonment of the federal wetland definition for the proposed alternative definition. As such, the EIR fails to provide an explanation of why adoption of the federal

wetland definition by the State Board is not feasible to meet the goals identified in Resolution 2008-0026. **The Project's definition of wetlands needs to use the definition that has historically been used by the USACE.**

**Creation of a State Regulatory Program for Wetlands – With a New, Independent Wetland Definition – Will Require Substantial Resources at a Time of Limited Government Funding**

In addition to the negative impact on economic development, adoption of a new wetland definition would require substantial cost to implement by the State Board (and Regional Boards) at a time of significant cuts in government programs and funding. In the past, the State has relied upon the Section 401 certification program in the Clean Water Act for many permitting decisions, with the USACE taking the lead on permitting decisions and shouldering the regulatory costs. If the new definition is adopted, the State would be required to review and process numerous permits relevant to projects, or portions of projects that do not meet the federal criteria, but meet only the State wetland criteria. The State and Regional Boards would also need to develop and provide regulatory guidance and compliance assistance in connection with the new wetland definition.

**The Wetland Proposal Fails to Provide Adequate Analysis to Support the Necessity for Creation of a Broad, New State Wetland Program**

Before implementing a broad, new regulatory program, we urge the State Board to conduct further investigation and provide additional analysis to determine whether there is, in fact, a need for the State to adopt a wetland definition inconsistent with the definition used by the federal government. Wetlands in California are already subject to strict protection under the federal Clean Water Act and existing State law, regulatory programs, and executive orders. To the extent the State Board identifies a need in the future for California to regulate wetlands beyond these existing regulatory programs, the State Board should limit the expansion of any new regulatory program to an extension of the existing federal definition of wetlands over "isolated" state waters.


To justify the need for a new wetland definition, the Wetland Proposal states a goal of "uniformly" protecting all waters of the State. The EIR seeks to justify the adoption of additional regulation by citing the "diminishing jurisdiction of the federal government" in regulating wetlands under the Clean Water Act and the "documented historic losses of aquatic resources." The EIR, however, fails to provide relevant analysis or information to support the need for the Wetland Proposal – or any increased regulation of wetlands – or the conclusion that wetland resources are disappearing at a material rate today.

The EIR does not cite to studies, or otherwise provide data showing that the current regulation of wetlands in the State, as of 2011, is inadequate or allowing for a material loss of wetland resources. The conclusion that California is "losing" wetlands is supported by citations to only two studies: (1) a 1990 study performed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicating that up to 91 percent of historic wetland acreage in California had been lost by the late 1980s, and (2) a 1994 Coastal Commission Study finding that wetland loss has varied by region. These reports are irrelevant and inadequate to determine whether the existing regulation of wetlands in California is lacking or whether wetland acreage is currently decreasing. Both of the reports were generated more than fifteen years ago. The time-periods examined by the reports pre-date adoption of the 1993 California State Wetland Conservation Policy, and largely characterize wetland loss that occurred prior to


implementation of the Clean Water Act Section 404 program by the United States. For example, the 1990 study evaluated wetland changes in California between the late 1700s and the late 1980s. Widespread protection of wetlands under the federal Clean Water Act did not begin until the mid-1980s. In order to justify a burdensome new regulatory program related to wetlands, the State Board needs to document that the current system for protecting wetlands has failed and, without a specific change, identifiable losses of wetlands will occur. This type of analysis is not included in the EIR.

Again thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you would like to discuss these comments further, please contact Bob Lucas at 916-444-7337.

Sincerely,



Robert W. Lucas  
Waste & Water Quality Project Manager



Gerald D. Secundy  
President

cc: The Gualco Group, Inc.

