

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE MITIGATION POLICY

I. PURPOSE

This document establishes policy for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommendations on mitigating the adverse impacts of land and water developments on fish, wildlife, their habitats, and uses thereof. It will help to assure consistent and effective recommendations by outlining policy for the levels of mitigation needed and the various methods for accomplishing mitigation. It will allow Federal action agencies and private developers to anticipate Service recommendations and plan for mitigation measures early, thus avoiding delays and assuring equal consideration of fish and wildlife resources with other project features and purposes. This policy provides guidance for Service personnel but variations appropriate to individual circumstances are permitted.

This policy supersedes the December 18, 1974, policy statement entitled "Position Paper of the Fish and Wildlife Service Relative to Losses to Fish and Wildlife Habitat Caused by Federally Planned or Constructed Water Resource Developments" and the Service River Basin Studies Manual Release 2.350 entitled "General Bureau Policy on River Basin Studies."

II. AUTHORITY

This policy is established in accordance with the following major authorities: (See Appendix A for other authorities.)

Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742(a)-754). This Act authorizes the development and distribution of fish and wildlife information to the public, Congress, and the President, and the development of policies and procedures that are necessary and desirable to carry out the laws relating to fish and wildlife including: (1) ". . . take such steps as may be required for the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of the fisheries resources;" and (2) ". . . take such steps as may be required for the development, management, advancement, conservation, and protection of wildlife resources through research . . . and other means."

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661-667(e)). This Act authorizes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and State agencies responsible for fish and wildlife resources to investigate all proposed Federal undertakings and non-Federal actions needing a Federal permit or

license which would impound, divert, deepen, or otherwise control or modify a stream or other body of water and to make mitigation and enhancement recommendations to the involved Federal agency. "Recommendations . . . shall be as specific as practicable with respect to features recommended for wildlife conservation and development, lands to be utilized or acquired for such purposes, the results expected, and shall describe the damage to wildlife attributable to the project and the measures proposed for mitigating or compensating for these damages." In addition, the Act requires that wildlife conservation be coordinated with other features of water resource development programs.

Determinations under this authority for specific projects located in estuarine areas constitute compliance with the provisions of the Estuary Protection Act. (See Appendix A.)

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001-1009). This Act allows the Secretary of the Interior to make surveys, investigations, and ". . . prepare a report with recommendations concerning the conservation and development of wildlife resources . . ." on small watershed projects.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321-4347). This Act and its implementing regulations (40 CFR Part 1500-1508) requires that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service be notified of all major Federal actions affecting fish and wildlife resources and their views and recommendations solicited. Upon completion of a draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Service is required to review it and make comments and recommendations, as appropriate. In addition, the Act provides that "the Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible . . . all agencies of the Federal Government shall . . . identify and develop methods and procedures . . . which will ensure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations."

III. SCOPE

A. Coverage

This policy applies to all activities of the Service related to the evaluation of impacts of land and water developments and the subsequent recommendations to mitigate those adverse impacts except as specifically excluded below. This includes: (1) investigations and recommendations for all actions

requiring a federally issued permit or license that would impact waters of the U.S.; (2) all major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment; and (3) other Federal actions for which the Service has legislative authority or executive direction for involvement including, but not limited to: coal, minerals, and outer continental shelf lease sales or Federal approval of State permit programs for the control of discharges of dredged or fill material.

B. Exclusions

This policy does not apply to threatened or endangered species. The requirements for threatened and endangered species are covered in the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and accompanying regulations at 50 CFR Parts 17, 402, and 424. Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, all Federal agencies shall ensure that activities authorized, funded, or carried out by them are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. Mitigating adverse impacts of a project would not in itself be viewed as satisfactory agency compliance with Section 7. Furthermore, it is clear to the Service that Congress considered the traditional concept of mitigation to be inappropriate for Federal activities impacting listed species or their critical habitat.

This policy does not apply to Service recommendations for Federal projects completed or other projects permitted or licensed prior to enactment of Service authorities (unless indicated otherwise in a specific statute) or specifically exempted by them and not subject to reauthorization or renewal. It also does not apply where mitigation plans have already been agreed to by the Service, except where new activities or changes in current activities would result in new impacts or where new authorities, new scientific information, or developer failure to implement agreed upon recommendations make it necessary. Service personnel involved in land and water development investigations will make a judgment as to the applicability of the policy for mitigation plans under development and not yet agreed upon as of the date of final publication of this policy.

Finally, this policy does not apply to Service recommendations related to the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources. Recommendations for measures which improve fish and wildlife resources beyond that which would exist without the project and which cannot be used to satisfy the

appropriate mitigation planning goal should be considered as enhancement measures. The Service strongly supports enhancement of fish and wildlife resources. The Service will recommend that all opportunities for fish and wildlife resource enhancement be thoroughly considered and included in project plans, to the extent practicable.

IV. DEFINITION OF MITIGATION

The President's Council on Environmental Quality defined the term "mitigation" in the National Environmental Policy Act regulations to include: "(a) avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action; (b) minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation; (c) rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment; (d) reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and (e) compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments." (40 CFR Part 1508.20(a-e)).

The Service supports and adopts this definition of mitigation and considers the specific elements to represent the desirable sequence of steps in the mitigation planning process. (See Appendix B for definitions of other important terms necessary to understand this policy.)

V. MITIGATION POLICY OF THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The overall goals and objectives of the Service are outlined in the Service Management Plan and an accompanying Important Resource Problems document which describes specific fish and wildlife problems of importance for planning purposes. Goals and objectives for Service activities related to land and water development are contained in the Habitat Preservation Program Management Document. The mitigation policy was designed to stand on its own; however, these documents will be consulted by Service personnel to provide the proper perspective for the Service mitigation policy. They are available upon request from the Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.

A. General Policy

The mission of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is to:

PROVIDE THE FEDERAL LEADERSHIP TO CONSERVE, PROTECT AND ENHANCE FISH AND WILDLIFE AND THEIR HABITATS FOR THE CONTINUING BENEFIT OF THE PEOPLE.

The goal of Service activities oriented toward land and water development responds to Congressional direction that fish and wildlife resource conservation receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of Federal resource development and regulatory programs through effective and harmonious planning, development, maintenance and coordination of fish and wildlife resource conservation and rehabilitation in the United States, its territories and possessions. The goal is to:

CONSERVE, PROTECT AND ENHANCE FISH AND WILDLIFE AND THEIR HABITATS AND FACILITATE BALANCED DEVELOPMENT OF THIS NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES BY TIMELY AND EFFECTIVE PROVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Fish and wildlife and their habitats are public resources with clear commercial, recreational, social, and ecological value to the Nation. They are conserved and managed for the people by State, Federal and Indian tribal Governments. If land or water developments are proposed which may reduce or eliminate the public benefits that are provided by such natural resources, then State and Federal resource agencies and Indian tribal agencies have a responsibility to recommend means and measures to mitigate such losses. Accordingly:

IN THE INTEREST OF SERVING THE PUBLIC, IT IS THE POLICY OF THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE TO SEEK TO MITIGATE LOSSES OF FISH, WILDLIFE, THEIR HABITATS, AND USES THEREOF FROM LAND AND WATER DEVELOPMENTS.

In administering this policy, the Service will strive to provide information and recommendations that fully support the Nation's need for fish and wildlife resource conservation as well as sound economic and social development through balanced multiple use of the Nation's natural resources. The Service will actively seek to facilitate needed development and avoid conflicts and delays through early involvement in land and water development planning activities in advance of proposals for specific projects or during the early planning and design stage of specific projects.

This should include early identification of resource areas containing high and low habitat values for important species and the

development of ecological design information that outlines specific practicable means and measures for avoiding or minimizing impacts. The former can be used by developers to site projects in the least valuable areas. This could possibly lower total project costs to development interests. These actions are part of good planning and are in the best public interest.

The early provision of information to private and public agencies in a form which enables them to avoid or minimize fish and wildlife losses as a part of initial project design is the preferred form of fish and wildlife conservation.

B. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Mitigation Planning Goals by Resource Category

The planning goals and guidelines that follow will be used to guide Service recommendations on mitigation of project impacts. Four Resource Categories are used to indicate that the level of mitigation recommended will be consistent with the fish and wildlife resource values involved.

The policy covers impacts to fish and wildlife populations, their habitat and the human uses thereof. However, the primary focus in terms of specific guidance is on recommendations related to habitat value losses. In many cases, compensation of habitat value losses should result in replacement of fish and wildlife populations and human uses. But where it does not, the Service will recommend appropriate additional means and measures.

RESOURCE CATEGORY 1

a. Designation Criteria

Habitat to be impacted is of high value for evaluation species and is unique and irreplaceable on a national basis or in the ecoregion section.

b. Mitigation Goal

No Loss of Existing Habitat Value.

c. Guideline

The Service will recommend that all losses of existing habitat be prevented as these one-of-a-kind areas cannot be replaced. Insignificant changes that do not result in adverse impacts on habitat value may be acceptable provided they will have no significant cumulative impact.

RESOURCE CATEGORY 2

a. Designation Criteria

Habitat to be impacted is of high value for evaluation species and is relatively scarce or becoming scarce on a national basis or in the ecoregion section.

b. Mitigation Goal

No Net Loss of In-Kind Habitat Value.

c. Guideline

The Service will recommend ways to avoid or minimize losses. If losses are likely to occur, then the Service will recommend ways to immediately rectify them or reduce or eliminate them over time. If losses remain likely to occur, then the Service will recommend that those losses be compensated by replacement of the same kind of habitat value so that the total loss of such in-kind habitat value will be eliminated.

Specific ways to achieve this planning goal include: (1) physical modification of replacement habitat to convert it to the same type lost; (2) restoration or rehabilitation of previously altered habitat; (3) increased management of similar replacement habitat so that the in-kind value of the lost habitat is replaced, or (4) a combination of these measures. By replacing habitat value losses with similar habitat values, populations of species associated with that habitat may remain relatively stable in the area over time. This is generally referred to as in-kind replacement.

Exceptions: An exception can be made to this planning goal when: (1) different habitats and species available for replacement are determined to be of greater value than those lost, or (2) in-kind replacement is not physically or biologically attainable in the ecoregion section. In either case, replacement involving different habitat kinds may be recommended provided that the total value of the habitat lost is recommended for replacement (see the guideline for Category 3 mitigation below).

RESOURCE CATEGORY 3**a. Designation Criteria**

Habitat to be impacted is of high to medium value for evaluation species and is relatively abundant on a national basis.

b. Mitigation Goal

No Net Loss of Habitat Value While Minimizing Loss of In-Kind Habitat Value.

c. Guideline

The Service will recommend ways to avoid or minimize losses. If losses are likely to occur, then the Service will recommend ways to immediately rectify them or reduce or eliminate them over time. If losses remain likely to occur, then the Service will recommend that those losses be compensated by replacement of habitat value so that the total loss of habitat value will be eliminated.

It is preferable, in most cases, to recommend ways to replace such habitat value losses in-kind. However, if the Service determines that in-kind replacement is not desirable or possible, then other specific ways to achieve this planning goal include: (1) substituting different kinds of habitats, or (2) increasing management of different replacement habitats so that the value of the lost habitat is replaced. By replacing habitat value losses with different habitats or increasing management of different habitats, populations of species will be different, depending on the ecological attributes of the replacement habitat. This will result in no net loss of total habitat value, but may result in significant differences in fish and wildlife populations. This is generally referred to as out-of-kind replacement.

RESOURCE CATEGORY 4**a. Designation Criteria**

Habitat to be impacted is of medium to low value for evaluation species.

b. Mitigation Goal

Minimize Loss of Habitat Value.

c. Guideline

The Service will recommend ways to avoid or minimize losses. If losses are likely to occur, then the Service will recommend ways to immediately rectify them or reduce or eliminate them over time. If losses remain likely to occur, then the Service may make a recommendation for compensation, depending on the significance of the potential loss.

However, because these areas possess relatively low habitat values, they will likely exhibit the greatest potential for significant habitat value improvements. Service personnel will fully investigate these areas' potential for improvement, since they could be used to mitigate Resource Category 2 and 3 losses.

C. Mitigation Planning Policies**1. State-Federal Partnership**

a. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will fully coordinate activities with those State agencies responsible for fish and wildlife resources, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) related to the investigation of project proposals and development of mitigation recommendations for resources of concern to the State, NMFS or EPA.

b. Service personnel will place special emphasis on working with State agencies responsible for fish and wildlife resources, NMFS and EPA to

develop compatible approaches and to avoid duplication of efforts.

2. Resource Category Determinations

a. The Service will make Resource Category determinations as part of the mitigation planning process. Such determinations will be made early in the planning process and transmitted to the Federal action agency or private developer to aid them in their project planning, to the extent practicable.

b. Resource Category determinations will be made through consultation and coordination with State agencies responsible for fish and wildlife resources and other Federal resource agencies, particularly the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Environmental Protection Agency, whenever resources of concern to those groups are involved. Where other elements of the public, including development groups, have information that can assist in making such determinations, the Service will welcome such information.

c. All Resource Category determinations will contain a technical rationale consistent with the designation criteria. The rationale will: (1) outline the reasons why the evaluation species were selected; (2) discuss the value of the habitat to the evaluation species; and (3) discuss and contrast the relative scarcity of the fish and wildlife resource on a national and ecoregion section basis.

Note.—If the State agency responsible for fish and wildlife resources wishes to outline scarcity on a more local basis, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service personnel should assist in developing such rationale, whenever practicable.

d. When funding, personnel, and available information make it practicable, specific geographic areas or, alternatively, specific habitat types that comprise a given Resource Category should be designated in advance of development. Priority for predesignation will be placed on those areas that are of high value for evaluation species and are subject to development pressure in the near future. Such predesignations can be used by developers or regulators to determine the least valuable areas for use in project planning and siting considerations.

e. The following examples should be given special consideration as either Resource Category 1 or 2:

(1) Certain habitats within Service-identified Important Resource Problem (IRP) areas. Those IRPs dealing with threatened or endangered species are not covered by this policy. (See Scope)

(2) Special aquatic and terrestrial sites including legally designated or set-aside

areas such as sanctuaries, fish and wildlife management areas, hatcheries, and refuges, and other aquatic sites such as floodplains, wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows, coral reefs, riffles and pools, and springs and seeps.

3. Impact Assessment Principles

a. Changes in fish and wildlife productivity or ecosystem structure and function may not result in a biologically adverse impact. The determination as to whether a biological change constitutes an adverse impact for which mitigation should be recommended is the responsibility of the Service and other involved Federal and State resource agencies.

b. The net biological impact of a development proposal (or alternatives) is the difference in predicted biological conditions between the future with the action and the future without the action. If the future without the action cannot be reasonably predicted and documented by the project sponsor, then the Service analysis should be based on biological conditions that would be expected to exist over the planning period due to natural species succession or implementation of approved restoration/improvement plans or conditions which currently exist in the planning area.

c. Service review of project impacts will consider, whenever practicable:

(1) The total long-term biological impact of the project, including any secondary or indirect impacts regardless of location; and (2) any cumulative effects when viewed in the context of existing or anticipated projects.

d. The *Habitat Evaluation Procedures* will be used by the Service as a basic tool for evaluating project impacts and as a basis for formulating subsequent recommendations for mitigation subject to the exemptions in the Ecological Services Manual (100 ESM 1). When the *Habitat Evaluation Procedures* do not apply, then other evaluation systems may be used provided such use conforms with policies provided herein.

e. In those cases where instream flows are an important determinant of habitat value, consideration should be given to the use of the Service's Instream Flow Incremental Methodology to develop instream flow mitigation recommendations, where appropriate.

f. Where specific impact evaluation methods or mitigation technologies are not available, Service employees shall continue to apply their best professional judgment to develop mitigation recommendations.

4. Mitigation Recommendations

a. The Service may recommend support of projects or other proposals when the following criteria are met:

(1) They are ecologically sound;

(2) The least environmentally damaging reasonable alternative is selected;

(3) Every reasonable effort is made to avoid or minimize damage or loss of fish and wildlife resources and uses;

(4) All important recommended means and measures have been adopted with guaranteed implementation to satisfactorily compensate for unavoidable damage or loss consistent with the appropriate mitigation goal; and

(5) For wetlands and shallow water habitats, the proposed activity is clearly water dependent and there is a demonstrated public need.

The Service may recommend the "no project" alternative for those projects or other proposals that do not meet all of the above criteria and where there is likely to be a significant fish and wildlife resource loss.

b. Recommendations will be presented by the Service at the earliest possible stage of project planning to assure maximum consideration. The Service will strive to provide mitigation recommendations that represent the best judgment of the Service, including consideration of cost, on the most effective means and measures of satisfactorily achieving the mitigation planning goal. Such recommendations will be developed in cooperation with the Federal action agency or private developer responsible for the project, whenever practicable, and will place heavy reliance on cost estimates provided by that Federal action agency or private developer.

c. The Service will recommend that the Federal action agency include designated funds for all fish and wildlife resource mitigation (including, but not limited to, Service investigation costs, initial development costs and continuing operation, maintenance, replacement, and administrative costs) as part of the initial and any alternative project plans and that mitigation funds (as authorized and appropriated by Congress for Federal projects) be spent concurrently and proportionately with overall project construction and operation funds throughout the life of the project.

Note.—Prevention of losses may necessitate expenditure of funds at an earlier stage of project planning. This is acceptable and preferred.

d. Service mitigation recommendations will be made under an explicit expectation that these means and measures: (1) would be the ultimate

responsibility of the appropriate Federal action agency to implement or enforce; and (2) would provide for a duration of effectiveness for the life of the project plus such additional time required for the adverse effects of an abandoned project to cease to occur.

e. Land acquisition in fee title for the purpose of compensation will be recommended by the Service *only* under one or more of the following three conditions:

(1) When a change in ownership is necessary to guarantee the future conservation of the fish and wildlife resource consistent with the mitigation goal for the specific project area; *or*

(2) When other means and measures for mitigation (see Section 5 below) will not compensate habitat losses consistent with the mitigation goal for the specific project area; *or*

(3) When land acquisition in fee title is the most cost-effective means that may partially or completely achieve the mitigation goal for the specific project area.

Service recommendations for fee title land acquisition will seek to identify mitigation lands with marginal economic potential.

f. First priority will be given to recommendation of a mitigation site within the planning area. Second priority will be given to recommendation of a mitigation site in proximity to the planning area within the same ecoregion section. Third priority will be given to recommendation of a mitigation site elsewhere within the same ecoregion section.

g. Service personnel will fully support a variety of uses on mitigation lands where such uses are compatible with dominant fish and wildlife uses and, for Federal wildlife refuges, are consistent with the provisions of the Refuge Recreation Act and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act. However, it may be in the best public interest to recommend limiting certain uses that would significantly decrease habitat value for species of high public interest. In such cases, the Service may recommend against such incompatible uses.

h. Measures to increase recreation values will not be recommended by Service personnel to compensate for losses of habitat value. Recreation use losses not restored through habitat value mitigation will be addressed through separate and distinct recommended measures to offset those specific losses.

i. The guidelines contained in this policy do not apply to threatened or endangered species. However, where both habitat and endangered or threatened species impacts are involved,

Service personnel shall fully coordinate Environment efforts with Endangered Species efforts to provide timely, consistent, and unified recommendations for resolution of fish and wildlife impacts, to the extent possible. More specifically, Environment and Endangered Species personnel shall coordinate all related activities dealing with investigations of land and water developments. This includes full use of all provisions that can expedite Service achievement of "one-stop shopping," including coordinated early planning involvement, shared permit review activities, consolidated permit reporting, and consolidated flow of pre-project information to developers, consistent with legislative mandates and deadlines.

j. The Service will place high priority on and continue to develop and implement procedures for reducing delays and conflicts in permit related activities. Such procedures will include, but not be limited to:

- (1) Joint processing of permits.
- (2) Resource mapping.
- (3) Early provision of ecological design information.

(4) Involvement in Special Area Management Planning.

k. The Service will encourage predevelopment compensation actions by Federal action agencies which can be used to offset future unavoidable losses for lands or waters not adequately protected by an existing law, policy, or program.

Banking of habitat value for the express purpose of compensation for unavoidable future losses will be considered to be a mitigation measure and not an enhancement measure. Withdrawals from the mitigation "bank" to offset future unavoidable losses will be based on habitat value replacement, not acreage or cost for land purchase and management.

5. Mitigation Means and Measures

Mitigation recommendations can include, but are not limited to, the types of actions presented below. These means and measures are presented in the general order and priority in which they should be recommended by Service personnel with the exception of the "no project" alternative. (See Section 4(a)).

a. Avoid the impact

(1) Design project to avoid damage or loss of fish and wildlife resources including management practices such as timing of activities or structural features such as multiple outlets, passage or avoidance structures and water pollution control facilities.

(2) Use of nonstructural alternative to proposed project.

(3) No project.

b. Minimize the impact

(1) Include conservation of fish and wildlife as an authorized purpose of Federal projects.

(2) Locate at the least environmentally damaging site.

(3) Reduce the size of the project.

(4) Schedule timing and control of initial construction operations and subsequent operation and maintenance to minimize disruption of biological community structure and function.

(5) Selective tree clearing or other habitat manipulation.

(6) Control water pollution through best management practices.

(7) Time and control flow diversions and releases.

(8) Maintain public access.

(9) Control public access for recreational or commercial purposes.

(10) Control domestic livestock use.

c. Rectify the impact

(1) Regrade disturbed areas to contours which provide optimal fish and wildlife habitat or approximate original contours.

(2) Seed, fertilize and treat areas as necessary to restore fish and wildlife resources.

(3) Plant shrubs and trees and other vegetation to speed recovery.

(4) Control polluted spoil areas.

(5) Restock fish and wildlife resources in repaired areas. Fish stocking or introductions will be consistent with the Service Fish Health Policy (January 3, 1978).

d. Reduce or eliminate the impact over time

(1) Provide periodic monitoring of mitigation features to assure continuous operation.

(2) Assure proper training of project personnel in the operations of the facility to preserve existing or restored fish and wildlife resources at project sites.

(3) Maintain or replace equipment or structures so that future loss of fish and wildlife resources due to equipment or structure failure does not occur.

e. Compensate for impacts

(1) Conduct wildlife management activities to increase habitat values of existing areas, with project lands and nearby public lands receiving priority.

(2) Conduct habitat construction activities to fully restore or rehabilitate previously altered habitat or modify existing habitat suited to evaluation

species for the purpose of completely offsetting habitat value losses.

(3) Build fishery propagation facilities.

(4) Arrange legislative set-aside or protective designation for public lands.

(5) Provide buffer zones.

(6) Lease habitat.

(7) Acquire wildlife easements.

(8) Acquire water rights.

(9) Acquire land in fee title.

6. Follow-up

The Service encourages, supports, and will initiate, whenever practicable, post-project evaluations to determine the effectiveness of recommendations in achieving the mitigation planning goal. The Service will initiate additional follow-up studies when funds are provided by the Federal action agency.

In those instances where Service personnel determine that Federal agencies or private developers have not carried out those agreed upon mitigation means and measures, then the Service will request the responsible Federal action agency to initiate corrective action.

APPENDIX A—OTHER AUTHORITIES AND DIRECTION FOR SERVICE MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS LEGISLATIVE

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.). The 1977 amendments require the Fish and Wildlife Service ". . . upon request of the Governor of a State, and without reimbursement, to provide technical assistance to such State in developing a Statewide (water quality planning) program and in implementing such program after its approval." In addition, this Act requires the Service to comment on proposed State permit programs for the control of discharges of dredged or fill material and to comment on all Federal permits within 90 days of receipt.

Federal Power Act of 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 791(a), 803, 811). This Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to impose conditions on licenses issued for hydroelectric projects within specific withdrawn public lands. The Secretary is given specific authority to prescribe fishways to be constructed, maintained, and operated at the licensee's expense.

Estuary Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1221–1226). This Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to review all project plans and reports for land and water resource development affecting estuaries and to make recommendations for conservation, protection, and enhancement.

Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451–1464). This Act

requires the Secretary of Commerce to obtain the views of Federal agencies affected by the program, including the Department of the Interior, and to ensure that these views have been given adequate consideration before approval of Coastal Zone Management Plans. The Service provides the Department's views about fish and wildlife resources. Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act Amendments of 1980 (Pub. L. 96-464) the Department of Interior provides comments on Federal grants to help States protect and preserve coastal areas because of their "... conservational, recreational, ecological or aesthetic values." The 1980 Amendments also authorize the Department of Interior to enter into Special Area Management Planning to "... provide for increased specificity in protecting natural resources, reasonable coast dependent economic growth . . . and improved predictability in government decisionmaking."

Water Bank Act (16 U.S.C. 1301-1311). This Act requires that the Secretary of Agriculture "... shall consult with the Secretary of Interior and take appropriate measures to insure that the program carried out . . . is in harmony with wetlands programs administered by the Secretary of the Interior."

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287). This Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to comment on such proposals. The Fish and Wildlife Service provides the Department's views with regard to fish and wildlife resources.

Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001-1025). This Act requires that the Fish and Wildlife Service recommend to the Secretary those lands that shall not be leased for geothermal development by reason of their status as "... a fish hatchery administered by the Secretary, wildlife refuge, wildlife range, game range, wildlife management area, waterfowl production area, or for lands acquired or reserved for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction."

Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.). This Act requires the Department of the Interior to regulate surface mining and reclamation at existing and future mining areas. The Fish and Wildlife Service provides the Department with technical assistance regarding fish and wildlife aspects of Department programs on active and abandoned mine lands, including review of State regulatory submissions and mining plans, and comments on mining and reclamation plans.

Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 1801). This Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to manage an environmentally sound oil and natural gas development program on the outer continental shelf. The Fish and Wildlife Service provides recommendations for the Department regarding potential ecological impacts before leasing in specific areas and contributes to environmental studies undertaken subsequent to leasing.

Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 185). This Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way through Federal lands for pipelines transporting oil, natural gas, synthetic liquids or gaseous fuels, or any other refined liquid fuel. Prior to granting a right-of-way for a project which may have a significant impact on the environment, the Secretary is required by this Act to request and review the applicant's plan for construction, operation, and rehabilitation of the right-of-way. Also, the Secretary is authorized to issue guidelines and impose stipulations for such projects which shall include, but not be limited to, "... requirements for restoration, revegetation and curtailment or erosion of surface land; . . . requirements designed to control or prevent damage to the environment (including damage to fish and wildlife habitat); and . . . requirements to protect the interests of individuals living in the general area of the right-of-way or permit who rely on the fish, wildlife and biotic resources of the area for subsistence purposes."

Cooperative Unit Act (16 U.S.C. 753(a)-753(b)). This Act provides for cooperative programs for research and training between the Fish and Wildlife Service, the States, and universities.

Airport and Airway Development Act (49 U.S.C. 1716). This Act requires the Secretary of Transportation to "... consult with the Secretary of the Interior with regard to the effect that any project . . . may have on natural resources including, but not limited to, fish and wildlife, natural, scenic, and recreation assets, water and air quality, and other factors affecting the environment . . ."

Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1653(f)). This Act makes it national policy that "... special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites . . ." and requires that the Secretary of Transportation "... cooperate and consult with the Secretary of the Interior in developing transportation plans and programs that include measures to maintain or enhance the natural beauty

of the lands traversed." The Department of Transportation projects using protected lands cannot be approved unless there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to avoid such use and, if none, all possible measures to minimize harm have been considered.

EXECUTIVE

President's Water Policy Message (June 6, 1978). This Message directs the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate procedures for determination of measures to mitigate losses of fish and wildlife resources.

Water Resources Council's Final Rules; Principles and Standards for Water and Related Land Resources Planning—Level C (September 29, 1980). These rules reiterate the importance of participation in the development planning process by interested Federal agencies, including the Department of the Interior. This participation includes review, coordination, or consultation required under various legislative and executive authorities. Under these rules, "Consideration is to be given to mitigation (as defined in 40 CFR 1508.20) of the adverse effects of each alternative plan. Appropriate mitigation is to be included where suitable as determined by the agency decisionmaker. Mitigation measures included are to be planned for at least concurrent and proportionate implementation with other major project features, except where such concurrent and proportionate mitigation is physically impossible. In the latter case, the reasons for deviation from this rule are to be presented in the planning report, and mitigation is to be planned for the earliest possible implementation. Mitigation for fish and wildlife and their habitat is to be planned in coordination with Federal and State fish and wildlife agencies in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (16 U.S.C. 661-664) (sic)."

Executive Order 11990—Protection of Wetlands (May 24, 1977). This Executive Order requires that each Federal agency "... take action to minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands, and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands in carrying out the agency's responsibilities for: (1) acquiring, managing and disposing of Federal lands and facilities; and (2) providing federally undertaken, financed or assisted construction and improvements; and (3) conducting Federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulation and licensing activities." Relevant wetland concerns and values include, but are not

limited to, maintenance of natural systems and long-term productivity of existing flora and fauna, habitat diversity, hydrological utility, fish, wildlife, timber, and food. Under this Order, a developmental project in a wetland may proceed only if no practicable alternatives can be ascertained and if the proposal . . . includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the wetland that may result from its use."

Executive Order 11988—Floodplain Management (May 24, 1977). This Executive Order requires that Federal agencies take floodplain management into account when formulating or evaluating water or land use plans and that these concerns be reflected in the budgets, procedures, and regulations of the various agencies. This Order allows developmental activities to proceed in floodplain areas only when the relevant agencies have ". . . considered alternatives to avoid adverse effects and incompatible development in the floodplains . . ." or when, in lieu of this, they have ". . . designed or modified their actions in order to minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain . . .".

Executive Order 11987—Exotic Organisms (May 24, 1977). This Executive Order requires that Federal agencies shall restrict, to the extent permitted by law, the introduction of exotic species into the lands or waters which they own, lease, or hold for purposes of administration, and encourage the States, local governments, and private citizens to do the same. This Executive Order also requires Federal agencies to restrict, to the extent permitted by law, the importation of exotic species and to restrict the use of Federal funds and programs for such importation. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, is authorized to develop by rule or regulation a system to standardize and simplify the requirements and procedures appropriate for implementing this Order.

NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

Federal Trust Responsibility to Indian Tribes. This responsibility is reflected in the numerous Federal treaties with the Indian tribes. These treaties have the force of law. Protection of Indian hunting and fishing rights necessitates conservation of fish and wildlife and their habitat.

Convention Between the United States and Japan (September 19, 1974). This Treaty endorses the establishment of sanctuaries and fixes preservation and enhancement of migratory bird

habitat as a major goal of the signatories.

Convention Between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Concerning the Conservation of Migratory Birds and Their Environments (November 8, 1978). This Treaty endorses the establishment of sanctuaries, refuges, and protected areas. It mandates reducing or eliminating damage to all migratory birds. Furthermore, it provides for designation of special areas for migratory bird breeding, wintering, feeding, and molting, and commits the signatories to ". . . undertake measures necessary to protect the ecosystems in these areas . . . against pollution, detrimental alteration and other environmental degradation."

Implementing legislation, Pub. L. 95-616, was passed in the United States in 1978.

Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere (April 15, 1941). This Treaty has several provisions requiring parties to conserve certain wildlife resources and their habitats.

Convention Between the United States and Great Britain (for Canada) for Protection of Migratory Birds (August 1, 1916, as amended January 30, 1979). This Treaty provides for a uniform ". . . system of protection for certain species of birds which migrate between the United States and Canada, in order to assure the preservation of species either harmless or beneficial to man." The Treaty prohibits hunting insectivorous birds, but allows killing of birds under permit when injurious to agriculture. The 1979 amendment allows subsistence hunting of waterfowl outside of the normal hunting season.

APPENDIX B—OTHER DEFINITIONS

"*Compensation*," when used in the context of Service mitigation recommendations, means full replacement of project-induced losses to fish and wildlife resources, provided such full replacement has been judged by the Service to be consistent with the appropriate mitigation planning goal.

"*Ecoregion*" refers to a large biogeographical unit characterized by distinctive biotic and abiotic relationships. An ecoregion may be subclassified into domains, divisions, provinces, and sections. A technical explanation and map is provided in the "Ecoregions of the United States" by Robert G. Bailey, published by the U.S. Forest Service, 1976.

"*Ecosystem*" means all of the biotic elements (i.e., species, populations, and communities) and abiotic elements (i.e., land, air, water, energy) interacting in a given geographic area so that a flow of

energy leads to a *clearly* defined trophic structure, biotic diversity, and material cycles. (Eugene P. Odum. 1971. *Fundamentals of Ecology*)

"*Evaluation species*" means those fish and wildlife resources in the planning area that are selected for impact analysis. They must currently be present or known to occur in the planning area during at least one stage of their life history except where species not present (1) have been identified in fish and wildlife restoration or improvement plans approved by State or Federal resource agencies, or (2) will result from natural species succession over the life of the project. In these cases, the analysis may include such identified species not currently in the planning area.

There are two basic approaches to the selection of evaluation species: (1) selection of species with high public interest, economic value or both; and (2) selection of species to provide a broader ecological perspective of an area. The choice of one approach in lieu of the other may result in a completely different outcome in the analysis of a proposed land or water development. Therefore, the objectives of the study should be clearly defined before species selection is initiated. If the objectives of a study are to base a decision on potential impacts to an entire ecological community, such as a unique wetland, then a more ecologically based approach is desirable. If, however, a land or water use decision is to be based on potential impacts to a public use area, then species selection should favor animals with significant human use values. In actual practice, species should be selected to represent social, economic and broad ecological views because mitigation planning efforts incorporate objectives that have social, economic, and ecological aspects. Species selection always should be approached in a manner that will optimize contributions to the stated objectives of the mitigation planning effort.

Most land and water development decisions are strongly influenced by the perceived impacts of the proposed action on human use. Since economically or socially important species have clearly defined linkages to human use, they should be included as evaluation species in all appropriate land and water studies. As a guideline, the following types of species should be considered:

- Species that are associated with Important Resource Problems as designated by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service (except for threatened or endangered species).

- Other species with monetary and non-monetary benefits to people accruing from consumptive and nonconsumptive human uses including, but not limited to, fishing, hunting, bird-watching and educational, aesthetic, scientific or subsistence uses.

An analysis based only on those species with directly identifiable economic or social value may not be broad enough to adequately describe all of the ramifications of a land and water use proposal. If it is desirable to increase the ecological perspective of an assessment, the following types of species should be considered:

- Species known to be sensitive to specific land and water use actions. The species selected with this approach serve as "early warning" or indicator species for the affected fish and wildlife community.

- Species that perform a key role in a community because of their role in nutrient cycling or energy flows. These species also serve as indicators for a large segment of the fish and wildlife community, but may be difficult to identify.

- Species that represent groups of species which utilize a common environmental resource (guilds). A representative species is selected from each guild and predicted environmental impacts for the selected species are extended with some degree of confidence to other guild members.

"Federal action agency" means a department, agency or instrumentality of the United States which plans, constructs, operates or maintains a project, or which plans for or approves a permit, lease, or license for projects or manages Federal lands.

"Fish and wildlife resources" means birds, fishes, mammals, and all other classes of wild animals and all types of aquatic and land vegetation upon which wildlife is dependent.

"Habitat" means the area which provides direct support for a given species, population, or community. It includes all environmental features that comprise an area such as air quality, water quality, vegetation and soil characteristics and water supply (including both surface and groundwater).

"Habitat value" means the suitability of an area to support a given evaluation species.

"Important Resource Problem" means a clearly defined problem with a single important population or a community of similar species in a given geographic area as defined by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

"In-kind replacement" means providing or managing substitute

resources to replace the habitat value of the resources lost, where such substitute resources are physically and biologically the same or closely approximate those lost.

"Loss" means a change in fish and wildlife resources due to human activities that is considered adverse and;

(1) reduces the biological value of that habitat for evaluation species;

(2) reduces population numbers of evaluation species;

(3) increases population numbers of "nuisance" species;

(4) reduces the human use of those fish and wildlife resources; or

(5) disrupts ecosystem structure and function.

Changes that improve the value of existing habitat for evaluation species are not to be considered losses, i.e., burning or selective tree harvesting for wildlife management purposes. In addition, reductions in animal populations for the purpose of harvest or fish and wildlife management will not be considered as losses for the purpose of this policy.

"Minimize" means to reduce to the smallest practicable amount or degree.

"Mitigation banking" means habitat protection or improvement actions taken expressly for the purpose of compensating for unavoidable losses from specific future development actions. It only includes those actions above and beyond those typically taken by Congress for protection of fish and wildlife resources.

"Out-of-kind replacement" means providing or managing substitute resources to replace the habitat value of the resources lost, where such substitute resources are physically or biologically different from those lost.

"Planning area" means a geographic space with an identified boundary that includes:

(1) The area identified in the study's authorizing document;

(2) The locations of resources included in the study's identified problems and opportunities;

(3) The locations of alternative plans, often called "project areas;" and

(4) The locations of resources that would be directly, indirectly, or cumulatively affected by alternative plans, often called the "affected area."

"Practicable" means capable of being done within existing constraints. The test of what is practicable depends upon the situation and includes consideration of the pertinent factors, such as environment, cost, or technology.

"Project" means any action, planning or approval process relating to an action

that will directly or indirectly affect fish and wildlife resources.

"Replacement" means the substitution or offsetting of fish and wildlife resource losses with resources considered to be of equivalent biological value. However, resources used for replacement represent loss or modification of another type of habitat value. Replacement actions still result in a loss of habitat acreage and types which will continually diminish the overall national resource base. It should be clearly understood that replacement actions never restore the lost fish and wildlife resource—that is lost forever.

Dated: January 13, 1981.

Cecil Andrus,

Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 81-1895 Filed 1-22-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-M