



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# Water Quality Issues in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress: An Overview

**Claudia Copeland**

Specialist in Resources and Environmental Policy

April 20, 2015

**Congressional Research Service**

7-5700

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

R43867

## Summary

Much progress has been made in achieving the ambitious goals that Congress established in 1972 in the Clean Water Act (CWA) to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters. However, long-standing problems persist, and new problems have emerged. Water quality problems are diverse, ranging from pollution runoff from farms and ranches, city streets, and other diffuse or "nonpoint" sources, to toxic substances discharged from factories and sewage treatment plants.

There is little agreement among stakeholders about what solutions are needed, whether legislation is required to address the nation's remaining water pollution problems, or whether regulatory authorities should be reduced. For some time, efforts to comprehensively amend the CWA have stalled as interests have debated whether and exactly how to change the law. Congress has instead focused legislative attention on enacting narrow bills to extend or modify selected CWA programs, but not comprehensive proposals.

Programs that regulate activities in wetlands have been of particular interest recently, especially CWA Section 404, which has been criticized by landowners for intruding on private land-use decisions and imposing excessive economic burdens. Environmentalists view this regulatory program as essential for maintaining the health of wetland ecosystems, and they are concerned about court rulings that have narrowed regulatory protection of wetlands. Many stakeholders desire clarification of the act's regulatory jurisdiction, but they differ on what solutions are appropriate. On March 25, 2014, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Army Corps of Engineers proposed a rule intended to clarify jurisdictional issues, but interpretive questions about the proposal remain controversial inside and outside of Congress. The agencies expect to issue a final rule by April 2015.

Another prominent water quality issue for some time has concerned financial aid for municipal wastewater treatment projects. House and Senate committees have approved bills to reauthorize CWA assistance on several occasions since the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, but, for various reasons, no legislation other than appropriations was enacted. At issue has been the role of the federal government in assisting states and cities in meeting needs to rebuild, repair, and upgrade wastewater treatment systems, especially in light of capital costs that are projected to be nearly \$300 billion over the next 20 years. The 113<sup>th</sup> Congress agreed to legislation that creates a pilot program to provide federal loans for water infrastructure projects (H.R. 3080/P.L. 113-121). The same legislation also revises certain of the water infrastructure financing provisions of the CWA.

A number of other water quality issues have been the subject of congressional oversight and legislation, with some legislators highly critical of EPA's recent regulatory initiatives and others more supportive. In several cases, policymakers have sought to curtail water quality protection initiatives under the CWA following court rulings that expanded the regulatory scope of the law. Among the topics of particular interest has been regulation of surface coal mining activities in Appalachia. Congressional interest in this and other topics has been reflected in specific legislative proposals and debate over policy provisions of bills providing appropriations for EPA. Members from both parties have raised questions about the cost-effectiveness of some of EPA's actions and whether the agency has exceeded its authority. In the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, scrutiny of EPA initiatives is widely expected to be intense.

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
Legislative and Oversight Issues .....	2
Regulatory Protection of Wetlands.....	3
Judicial Proceedings Involving Section 404 .....	4
Proposed Rule to Define “Waters of the United States” .....	6
Authorization of Clean Water Infrastructure Funding.....	9
Issues Affecting Legislative Efforts .....	12
WIFIA Pilot Program and SRF Amendments in P.L. 113-121 .....	13
Other Clean Water Act Issues.....	14
Mountaintop Mining in Appalachia .....	14
Continuing Issue: Appropriations .....	16
FY2015 Appropriations.....	17
FY2016 Appropriations.....	17

## Tables

Table 1. Clean Water SRF Capitalization Grants, FY2008-FY2016 Request.....	11
--	----

## Contacts

Author Contact Information.....	18
---------------------------------	----

## Introduction

Much progress has been made in achieving the ambitious goals that Congress established 40 years ago to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters. However, long-standing problems persist, and new problems have emerged. Water quality problems are diverse, ranging from pollution runoff from farms and ranches, city streets, and other diffuse or "nonpoint" sources, to "point" source discharges of metals and organic and inorganic toxic substances from factories and sewage treatment plants.

The principal law that deals with polluting activity in the nation's streams, lakes, estuaries, and coastal waters is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (P.L. 92-500, enacted in 1972), commonly known as the Clean Water Act, or CWA. It consists of two major parts: regulatory provisions that impose progressively more stringent requirements on industries and cities to abate pollution and meet the statutory goal of zero discharge of pollutants; and provisions that authorize federal financial assistance for municipal wastewater treatment plant construction. Both parts are supported by research activities, plus permit and enforcement provisions. Programs at the federal level are administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); state governments have primary day-to-day responsibilities to implement CWA programs through standard-setting, permitting, enforcement, and administering financial assistance programs. Local governments also have important roles in implementing water quality protection programs, such as building and operating municipal wastewater treatment plants and regulating local pollution sources.<sup>1</sup>

The water quality restoration objective declared in the 1972 act was accompanied by statutory goals to attain, wherever possible, waters deemed "fishable and swimmable" by 1983 and to eliminate the discharge of pollutants into navigable waters by 1985. Although those goals have not been fully achieved, considerable progress has been made, especially in controlling conventional pollutants (suspended solids, bacteria, and oxygen-consuming materials) discharged by industries and sewage treatment plants.

Progress has been mixed in controlling discharges of toxic pollutants (heavy metals, inorganic and organic chemicals), which are more numerous and can harm human health and the environment even when present in very small amounts—at the parts-per-billion level. Moreover, efforts to control pollution from diffuse sources, termed nonpoint source pollution (rainfall runoff and snowmelt from urban, suburban, and agricultural areas, for example), are more recent, given the earlier emphasis on "point source" pollution (discharges from industrial facilities and municipal wastewater treatment plants). Overall, data reported by EPA and states indicate that 44% of river and stream miles assessed by states and 64% of assessed lake acres do not meet applicable water quality standards and are impaired for one or more desired uses.<sup>2</sup> In 2006 EPA issued an assessment of streams and small rivers, reporting that 67% of U.S. stream miles are in poor or fair condition and that nutrients and streambed sediments have the largest adverse impact on the aquatic species in these waters.<sup>3</sup> A similar assessment of the health of the nation's lakes, issued in 2009, found that 56% are in good biological condition, but that about 20% of lakes have

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information, see CRS Report RL30030, *Clean Water Act: A Summary of the Law*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *National Water Quality Inventory: Report to Congress, 2004 Reporting Cycle*, EPA 841-R-08-001, January 2009, [http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/guidance/cwa/305b/2004report\\_index.cfm](http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/guidance/cwa/305b/2004report_index.cfm).

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Wadeable Streams Assessment: A Collaborative Survey of the Nation's Streams*, EPA 841-B-06-002, December 2006, <http://www.epa.gov/owow/streamsurvey/>.

high levels of phosphorus or nitrogen and are more likely to have poor biological health than lakes without excess nutrients.<sup>4</sup> Approximately 95,000 lakes and 544,000 river miles in the United States are under fish-consumption advisories (including 100% of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters), due to chemical contaminants, and one-third of shellfishing beds are closed or restricted due to toxic pollutant contamination. Mercury is a contaminant of growing concern—in 2010, approximately 16.3 million lake acres and 1.14 million river miles were under fish or shellfish consumption advisory because of elevated mercury levels. Mercury concentrations in game fish exceed health-based limits in about half of U.S. lakes.<sup>5</sup>

The last major amendments to the CWA were the Water Quality Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-4). That legislation culminated six years of congressional efforts to extend and revise the act and were the most comprehensive amendments since 1972. Authorizations of appropriations for some programs provided in P.L. 100-4, such as grant assistance to states, research, and general EPA support, expired in FY1990 and FY1991. Authorizations for wastewater treatment funding expired in FY1994. None of these programs has lapsed, however, as Congress has continued to appropriate funds to implement them. EPA, states, industry, and other citizens continue to implement the 1987 legislation.

The Clean Water Act has been viewed as one of the most successful environmental laws in terms of achieving its statutory goals, which have been widely supported by the public. Lately, however, some have questioned whether additional actions to achieve further benefits are worth the costs, especially in view of the continuing problems of the U.S. economy. Criticism has come from industry, which has been the long-standing focus of the act's regulatory programs and often opposes imposition of new stringent and costly requirements. Criticism also has come from developers and property rights groups who contend that federal regulations (particularly the act's wetlands permit program) are a costly intrusion on private land-use decisions. States and cities have traditionally supported water quality programs and federal funding to assist them in carrying out the law, but many have opposed CWA measures that they fear might impose new unfunded mandates. Many environmental groups believe that strengthening of the law is needed to maintain progress achieved to date and to address remaining water quality problems.

## Legislative and Oversight Issues

October 2012 marked the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of passage of the Clean Water Act and 25 years since the last major amendments to the law were enacted. While there has been measurable clean water progress as a result of the act, observers and analysts agree that significant water pollution problems remain. However, there is less agreement about what solutions are needed and whether new legislation is required. Several key water quality issues exist: what additional actions, if any, should be taken to implement existing provisions of the law; whether additional steps are necessary to achieve overall goals of the act that have not yet been attained; how to ensure that progress made to date is not lost through diminished attention to water quality needs; whether existing regulatory authorities should be reduced; and what is the appropriate federal role in guiding and paying for clean water infrastructure and other activities. For some time, efforts to comprehensively amend the act have stalled as interests have debated whether and exactly how to

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water and Office of Research and Development, *National Lakes Assessment: A Collaborative Survey of the Nation's Lakes*, EPA-R-09-001, 2009.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

change the law. Many issues that might be addressed involve making difficult tradeoffs between impacts on different sectors of the economy; taking action when there is technical or scientific uncertainty; and allocating governmental responsibilities among federal, state, local, and tribal entities for implementing the law.

These factors partly explain why Congress has recently focused legislative attention on narrow bills to extend or modify selected CWA programs, rather than taking up comprehensive proposals. Other factors also have been at work. These include a lack of legislative initiatives by the Administration on clean water issues (neither the Clinton nor the Bush Administration proposed CWA legislation, nor has the Obama Administration); and the high economic cost of addressing water infrastructure issues.

After the 2010 election, congressional attention turned significantly to oversight and legislation focused on criticism of EPA regulatory activities—particularly in the House, which passed a number of bills to limit EPA’s regulatory authority. The Senate did not act on these measures. The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted two bills that amend the CWA. One extended the moratorium for CWA permitting of certain vessels for an additional year, until December 18, 2014 (P.L. 112-213), and the other extended authorization of funds for the Lake Pontchartrain Basin program in Section 121 of the act through FY2017 (P.L. 112-237). The 113<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted several bills with CWA provisions:

- Provisions of water resource legislation with some amendments to CWA Title VI, plus a pilot program for water infrastructure financing (see “WIFIA Pilot Program and SRF Amendments in P.L. 113-121” below);
- As part of the 2014 farm bill, legislation exempting most silviculture activity from requiring a CWA permit;<sup>6</sup>
- Legislation providing an additional three-year moratorium for CWA permitting of certain vessels;<sup>7</sup> and
- A bill eliminating a number of statutorily required reports to Congress, including one CWA report (P.L. 113-188).

Two CWA issues that have been the focus of much of legislators’ interest in recent Congresses—regulatory protection of wetlands and water infrastructure financing—are discussed next.

## **Regulatory Protection of Wetlands**

How best to protect the nation’s remaining wetlands and regulate activities taking place in wetlands has become one of the most contentious environmental policy issues. Much of the debate has focused on the CWA, which contains a key wetlands regulatory tool. The permit program in CWA Section 404 requires landowners or developers to obtain permits for disposal of dredged or fill material that is generated by construction or similar activity into navigable waters of the United States, including wetlands. Section 404 has evolved through judicial interpretation and regulatory change to become one of the principal federal tools used to protect wetlands,

---

<sup>6</sup> For discussion, see CRS Report R42883, *Water Quality Issues in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress: An Overview*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>7</sup> See CRS Report R42142, *EPA’s Vessel General Permits: Background and Issues*, by Claudia Copeland.

although that term appears only once in Section 404 itself and is not defined there. At the same time, its implementation has come to be seen as intrusive and burdensome to those whose activities it regulates. At issue today is how to address criticism of the Section 404 regulatory program while achieving goals of wetlands protection in the context of meeting the objectives of the CWA.<sup>8</sup> Recently, the issue of wetlands management and protection has been central to controversy surrounding an Obama Administration regulatory proposal to define “waters of the United States,” that is, which surface waters and wetlands are subject to the CWA’s regulatory requirements and protection (see “Proposed Rule to Define “Waters of the United States”” below).

Unlike the rest of the act, the permit aspects of Section 404 are administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, rather than EPA, although the Corps uses environmental guidance jointly developed with EPA to evaluate permit applications. Also, the act authorizes EPA to veto a 404 permit that does not meet the law’s requirements. Other federal agencies, including the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), have more limited roles in the Corps’ permitting decisions. Tension has existed for many years between the regulation of activities in wetlands under Section 404 and related laws, on the one hand, and the desire of landowners to develop property that may include wetlands, on the other hand. The conflicts over wetlands regulation have for the most part been addressed in administrative and judicial proceedings, as Congress has not amended Section 404 since 1977, when it provided exemptions for categories of routine activities, such as normal farming and forestry. Controversy has grown over the extent of federal jurisdiction and impacts on private property, burdens and delay of permit procedures, and roles of federal agencies and states in issuing permits.

## Judicial Proceedings Involving Section 404

One issue involving long-standing controversy and litigation is whether isolated waters are properly within the jurisdiction of Section 404. Waters and wetlands that appear to be isolated—e.g., they are not physically adjacent to navigable surface waters—or streams that are wet only for portions of the year may appear to provide only some of the values for which wetlands are protected, such as flood control or water purification, even if they meet the technical definition of a wetland.<sup>9</sup> Questions about whether such waters and wetlands are jurisdictional for CWA purposes have been extensively litigated.

## SWANCC and Rapanos

In 2001, the Supreme Court ruled on the question of whether the CWA provides the Corps and EPA with authority over isolated waters. The Court’s 5-4 ruling in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*<sup>10</sup> held that the Corps’ denial of a 404 permit for a disposal site on isolated wetlands solely on the basis that migratory birds use the site exceeded the authority provided in the act.

---

<sup>8</sup> For additional information, see CRS Report RL33483, *Wetlands: An Overview of Issues*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>9</sup> Scientists generally agree that the presence of a wetland can be determined by a combination of soils, plants, and hydrology. See the discussion in CRS Report RL33483, *Wetlands: An Overview of Issues*.

<sup>10</sup> 531 U.S. 159 (2001).

In 2006, the Supreme Court revisited issues related to the extent of CWA jurisdiction in two consolidated cases brought by landowners (*Rapanos v. United States*; and *Carabell v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*) seeking to narrow the scope of the 404 permit program as it applies to development of wetlands. The issue in both cases had to do with the reach of the CWA to cover “waters” that were not navigable waters in the traditional sense, but were connected somehow to navigable waters or “adjacent” to those waters. (The act requires a federal permit to discharge dredged or fill materials into “navigable waters.”) Many legal and other observers hoped that the Court’s ruling in these cases would bring greater clarity about the scope of federal jurisdiction.

The Court’s ruling on the two cases was issued in June 2006.<sup>11</sup> In a 5-4 decision, a plurality of the Court, led by Justice Scalia, held that the lower court had applied an incorrect standard to determine whether the wetlands at issue are covered by the CWA. Justice Kennedy joined this plurality to vacate the lower court decisions and remand the cases for further consideration, but he took different positions on most of the substantive issues raised by the cases, as did four other dissenting Justices.<sup>12</sup> Because the several opinions written by the Justices did not draw a clear line regarding which wetlands and other waters are subject to federal jurisdiction, one result has been more case-by-case determinations and continuing litigation. There also has been pressure on the Corps and EPA to clarify the issues through an administrative rulemaking.

The full extent of impacts on the regulatory program resulting from these decisions still remains unclear, in part because of different interpretations of both rulings reflected in subsequent federal court cases. While it continues to be difficult to fully assess how regulatory protection of wetlands will be affected as a result of the decisions and other possible changes, the remaining responsibility to protect affected wetlands falls on states and localities. Environmentalists believe that the Court misinterpreted congressional intent on the matter, while industry and landowner groups welcomed the rulings. Policy implications of how much the decisions restrict federal regulation depend on how broadly or narrowly the opinions are applied. Some federal courts have interpreted *SWANCC* and *Rapanos* narrowly, thus limiting effects on existing permit rules, while a few have read the decisions more broadly, resulting in a more restrictive interpretation of regulatory jurisdiction.

### ***Corps/EPA Guidance***

Following both the *SWANCC* and *Rapanos* rulings, EPA and the Corps issued guidance in 2003 and 2008 to enable their field staffs to make CWA jurisdictional determinations in light of the decisions. Environmental groups criticized the guidance, saying that the agencies are substantially limiting the scope of waters that are protected by the CWA. Industry groups such as developers remain frustrated by what they see as inconsistencies and delays in obtaining needed permits.

The Obama Administration entered this debate in April 2011, when EPA and the Corps proposed new guidance to replace the agencies’ guidance, which remain in effect until issuance of new guidance or rules. The proposed new guidance was intended to clarify regulatory jurisdiction over U.S. waters and wetlands, consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and agency regulations. Like previous guidance documents, the Obama draft examined current regulatory definitions of waters that are subject to CWA jurisdiction, such as interstate waters, and tributaries (at 33 C.F.R.

<sup>11</sup> *Rapanos v. United States*, 547 U.S. 715 (2006).

<sup>12</sup> For additional information, see CRS Report RL33263, *The Wetlands Coverage of the Clean Water Act (CWA): Rapanos and Beyond*, by Robert Meltz and Claudia Copeland.



§328.3 and 40 C.F.R. §230.3) in light of the Supreme Court’s rulings to determine which waters are clearly subject to the CWA, which waters are not, and which waters require a case-specific analysis in order to determine jurisdiction. The document stated that “after careful review of these opinions, the agencies concluded that previous guidance did not make full use of the authority provided by the CWA to include waters within the scope of the Act, as interpreted by the Court.” Based on current interpretations, the agencies expected that

the extent of waters over which the agencies assert jurisdiction under the CWA will increase compared to the extent of waters over which jurisdiction has been asserted under existing guidance, though certainly not to the full extent that it was typically asserted prior to the Supreme Court decisions in *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*.<sup>13</sup>

This conclusion was based on the agencies’ view that the 2011 draft guidance would provide clarity by asserting jurisdiction over some waters that previously were uncertain. EPA and the Corps believed that the resulting expanded jurisdiction would not be great, in terms of acreage or stream miles.

The 2011 proposed guidance quickly generated substantial controversy. Some critics argued that the guidance represented over-reaching by the agencies, beyond authority provided by Congress. Others faulted the continued reliance on federal guidance, which is not binding and lacks the force of law, yet can have significant impact on regulated entities.

### **Proposed Rule to Define “Waters of the United States”**

For various reasons, the 2011 draft guidance was not finalized, and in September 2013, EPA and the Corps announced that the document had been withdrawn from interagency review and also announced that revised regulations to define “waters of the United States” were being developed. On March 25, 2014, the agencies released a proposed rule.<sup>14</sup> The agencies accepted public comment on the proposal until November 14, 2014.<sup>15</sup>

According to the agencies, the proposed rule would revise the existing administrative definition of “waters of the United States” consistent with legal rulings and science concerning the interconnectedness of tributaries, wetlands, and other waters and effects of these connections on the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of downstream waters. The rule retains much of the structure of the agencies’ existing definition of “waters of the United States.” It is particularly focused on clarifying the regulatory status of waters located in isolated places in a landscape, the types of waters with ambiguous jurisdictional status following the Supreme Court’s 2001 ruling in *SWANCC*, and small streams, rivers that flow for part of the year, and nearby wetlands, the types of waters affected by the Court’s 2006 ruling in *Rapanos*.

Like the 2003 and 2008 guidance documents, the rule proposes categories of waters that are and are not jurisdictional, as well as categories of waters and wetlands that require a case-specific

---

<sup>13</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, “Draft Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act,” April 27, 2011, p. 3, on file with author.

<sup>14</sup> For more information on the proposal, see CRS Report R43455, *EPA and the Army Corps’ Proposed Rule to Define “Waters of the United States,”* by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>15</sup> Department of Defense, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, and Environmental Protection Agency, “Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’ Under the Clean Water Act, Proposed Rule,” 79 *Federal Register* 22188-22274, April 21, 2014.

evaluation to determine if CWA jurisdiction applies. It would not modify some categories of waters that currently are jurisdictional by rule (traditional navigable waters, interstate waters and wetlands, the territorial seas, and impoundments). But, proposed changes would increase the asserted scope of CWA jurisdiction, in part as a result of expressly declaring some types of waters categorically jurisdictional (such as all waters adjacent to a jurisdictional water), and also by application of new regulatory definitions, which give larger regulatory context to some types of waters, such as tributaries. The proposal also would identify waters that are categorically not jurisdictional, such as ditches in uplands that have less than perennial flow. EPA and the Corps believe that the proposed rule will provide greater clarity and certainty to the regulated community regarding waters that are and are not jurisdictional under the CWA, but some waters will continue to require case-specific evaluation to determine if there is a “significant nexus” to a jurisdictional water.

The agencies believe that the proposal does not exceed the CWA’s coverage or protect new types of waters that have not been protected historically, nor does it exceed the scope the scope allowed by the courts. While it would enlarge jurisdiction beyond that under the existing EPA-Corps guidance, they believe that it would not enlarge jurisdiction beyond what is consistent with the Supreme Court’s narrow reading of jurisdiction under *SWANCC* and *Rapanos*. They further believe that waters that would be expressly excluded under definitions in the rule would actually decrease jurisdiction. Others disagree: agriculture and other groups assert that the agencies are proposing to expand the jurisdiction of the CWA beyond what the law and the courts allow.

Also in September 2013, EPA released a draft report that reviews and synthesizes the peer-reviewed scientific literature on the connectivity or isolation of streams and wetlands relative to large water bodies such as rivers, lakes, estuaries, and oceans. The purpose of the review, which synthesizes a large body of published and peer-reviewed scientific reports, is to summarize current understanding about these connections, the factors that influence them, and mechanisms by which connected waters affect the function or condition of downstream waters. EPA and the Corps used the draft report during development of the proposed rule, and officials said that the rule takes into consideration the latest peer-reviewed science reflected in the draft science report.

EPA asked its Science Advisory Board (SAB) to review the draft report and to comment on whether its conclusions and findings are supported by the available science. An ad hoc panel of the SAB completed its review in August. The panel found that the draft connectivity study accurately established linkages between streams, wetlands, and downstream waters, and it concluded that the study would be useful to policymakers if it provides some estimate about the relative certainty of linkages between waters and wetlands in uplands and downstream navigable waters.<sup>16</sup> Based on the SAB’s review, EPA and the Corps EPA released a revised and final connectivity report on January 15, 2015, stating that it can be used to inform future policy and regulatory decisions, including the “waters of the United States” rule.<sup>17</sup> The final report, synthesizing more than 1,200 publications, is not intended as a policy document—it does not

---

<sup>16</sup> Science Advisory Board, “SAB Review of the Draft EPA Report Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review and Synthesis of the Scientific Evidence, Draft Report,” August 11, 2014, 105 p., [http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/SABPRODUCT.NSF/81e39f4c09954fcb85256ead006be86e/212BB1480331835285257D350041A1C0/\\$File/SAB+Connectivity+Panel+Draft+Report\\_8\\_11\\_14\\_%28quality+review+draft%29.pdf](http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/SABPRODUCT.NSF/81e39f4c09954fcb85256ead006be86e/212BB1480331835285257D350041A1C0/$File/SAB+Connectivity+Panel+Draft+Report_8_11_14_%28quality+review+draft%29.pdf).

<sup>17</sup>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, *Connectivity of Streams & Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review & Synthesis of the Scientific Evidence*, EPA/600/R-14-475F, January 2015. See <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=296414>.

reference either the Scalia plurality or Kennedy tests in *Rapanos*, nor does it consider or set forth legal standards for CWA jurisdiction. Nevertheless, some stakeholders are concerned that the scientific study could allow the agencies to assert jurisdiction in a blanket fashion over ephemeral and intermittent streams, rather than subjecting them to case-by-case determination of a “significant nexus” to downstream navigable waters.

More than 1 million public comments on the proposed rule were received during the comment period. The agencies completed revisions to the proposal and submitted a final rule to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on April 3. The OMB review is usually the last step before a federal agency releases a rule. EPA and Corps officials have said that they expect to publish a final rule in the spring of 2015.

### ***Legislative Responses***

Congressional committees have held oversight hearings on both the *SWANCC* and *Rapanos* decisions, seeking clarification of interpretations and impacts of the rulings. But the uncertainties about federal jurisdiction over wetlands and other waters raised by the rulings remain highly controversial. In response, legislation to overturn the decisions by providing a broad definition of “waters of the United States” has been introduced regularly since the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, and one such bill was reported by a Senate committee in the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress.<sup>18</sup> Legislation that instead would narrow the definition of “waters of the United States” also has been introduced.

Environmental advocates and others contend that Congress must clarify the important issues left unsettled by the Supreme Court’s 2001 and 2006 rulings and by the Corps/EPA guidance. They also argue that legislation is needed to “reaffirm” what Congress intended when the CWA was enacted in 1972 and what EPA and the Corps have subsequently been practicing until the two Supreme Court rulings, in terms of CWA jurisdiction. But critics questioned the constitutionality of legislation that was proposed and asserted that it would expand federal authority, thus likely increasing confusion, rather than settling it.

EPA’s and the Corps’ efforts to develop revised *Rapanos* guidance and revised regulations have been controversial and received congressional attention. Legislative provisions to prohibit the agencies from funding activities related to the guidance and the proposed “waters” rule were included in several appropriations bills since the 112<sup>th</sup> and 113<sup>th</sup> Congresses. One such provision was enacted as part of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (H.R. 83/P.L. 113-235), enacted in December 2014. It includes a provision requiring EPA and the Corps to withdraw an interpretive rule related to the proposed “waters” rule that addresses permit exemptions for agricultural activities, which created controversy and confusion.<sup>19</sup> The appropriations act did not include any policy provisions on the proposed “waters” rule itself.

Interest in legislation concerning the guidance included bills in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, such as S. 1006 and H.R. 1829, to prevent the agencies from finalizing the 2011 draft guidance, which has now been withdrawn, and S. 2496, which would have barred EPA or the Corps from finalizing the 2014 proposed “waters of the United States” rule. Other proposals were S. 890/H.R. 3377, which

---

<sup>18</sup> For information, see CRS Report RL33263, *The Wetlands Coverage of the Clean Water Act (CWA): Rapanos and Beyond*.

<sup>19</sup> See CRS Report IN10212, *Withdrawal of the EPA-Army Corps Interpretive Rule for Agriculture*, by Claudia Copeland.

would have amended the CWA with a narrow definition of waters that are subject to the act's jurisdiction.<sup>20</sup>

In September 2013, the House passed H.R. 5078, which would have prevented the agencies from finalizing the proposed "waters" rule and required withdrawal of the related interpretive rule on agricultural exemptions. The Senate did not take up this bill. The same legislation has been reintroduced in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress as H.R. 594.

## Authorization of Clean Water Infrastructure Funding

Meeting the nation's needs to build, upgrade, rebuild, and repair wastewater infrastructure is a significant element in achieving the CWA's water quality objectives and an issue of continuing interest to policymakers. The act's program of financial aid for municipal wastewater treatment plant construction is a key contributor to that effort. Since 1972, Congress has provided nearly \$93 billion to assist cities in constructing projects to achieve the act's requirements for secondary treatment of municipal sewage (equivalent to 85% reduction of wastes), or more stringent treatment where required by local water quality conditions. State and local governments have spent more than \$25 billion of their own funds for construction, as well. Federal funds can only be used for construction purposes (i.e., new plants or upgrades), but not for operation and maintenance of facilities, which are funded from local sources.

Still, funding needs remain very high: an additional \$298 billion, according to the most recent Needs Survey estimate by EPA and the states, a 17% increase above the estimate reported four years earlier.<sup>21</sup> This estimate includes \$187.9 billion for wastewater treatment and collection systems (\$26.7 billion more than the previous report), which represent more than 60% of all needs; \$63.6 billion for combined sewer overflow corrections (\$1.4 billion less than the previous estimate); \$42.3 billion for stormwater management (\$17 billion more than the previous estimate); and \$4.4 billion to build systems to distribute recycled water (\$700 million less than the previous estimate).

While water infrastructure investments are made and projects are built, new funding needs also are identified. Rather than decreasing over time, estimates of funding needs continue to grow. EPA reported several reasons for increased funding needs, which were \$23 billion higher than in the previous report. Cited reasons include improvements needed to meet more protective water quality standards, rehabilitation of aging infrastructure, and expanding capacity to meet population growth. Needs for stormwater management increased by \$17 billion and were mostly due to emerging needs to provide "green" infrastructure (e.g., use of wetland and other natural systems to capture stormwater) as a supplement to traditional stormwater treatment structures. The estimates do not explicitly include funding needed to address security issues, or funding possibly needed for treatment works to adapt to climate change impacts.

Debate over the nation's efforts regarding wastewater infrastructure was a central part of the 1987 CWA amendments. The amendments extended through FY1990 the traditional Title II program of grants for sewage treatment project construction, under which the federal share was 55% of

<sup>20</sup> For additional discussion, see CRS Report R43943, *EPA and the Army Corps' Proposed "Waters of the United States" Rule: Congressional Response and Options*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>21</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Clean Watersheds Needs Survey 2008, Report to Congress*, Washington, June 2010, <http://water.epa.gov/scitech/datait/databases/cwns/upload/cwns2008rtc.pdf>.

project costs. The 1987 law initiated a program of grants to capitalize State Water Pollution Control Revolving Funds (SRFs), which are loan programs, in a new Title VI. Under the revolving fund concept, monies used for wastewater treatment construction are repaid by loan recipients to the states (repayment was not required for grants under the Title II program), to be used for future construction in other communities, thus providing an ongoing source of financing. The expectation in 1987 was that the federal contributions to SRFs would assist in making a transition to full state and local financing by FY1995. Although most states believe that the SRF is working well, continuing large funding needs have delayed the anticipated shift to full state responsibility. Thus, SRF issues have been prominent on the Clean Water Act reauthorization agenda in recent Congresses.<sup>22</sup>

SRF monies may be used for specified activities, including making loans for as much as 100% of project costs (at or below market interest rates, including interest-free loans), to buy or refinance cities' debt obligation, or as a source of revenue or security for payment of principal and interest on a state-issued bond. SRF monies also may be used to provide loan guarantees or credit enhancement for localities. Loans made by a state from its SRF are to be used first to assure progress toward the goals of the act and, in particular, on projects to meet the standards and enforceable requirements of the act. After states achieve those requirements, SRF monies also may be used to implement national estuary programs and nonpoint pollution management. Since the SRF program began, states have used about 4% of clean water SRF funds to assist nonpoint management projects and estuary projects.

All states have established the mechanisms to administer the loan program and have been receiving SRF capitalization funds under Title VI. Congressional oversight has examined the progress toward reducing the backlog of wastewater treatment facilities needed to achieve the act's water quality objectives, while estimates of future funding needs have drawn increased attention to the role of the SRF program in meeting such needs. Although there has been some criticism of the SRF program, and debate continues over specific concerns, the basic approach is well supported. Congress used the clean water SRF as the model when it established a drinking water SRF in 1996 (P.L. 104-182).<sup>23</sup>

The initial intent was to phase out federal support for this program, but Congress has continued to appropriate SRF capitalization grants to the states—a total of \$41 billion since the 1987 amendments, providing an average of \$1.45 billion annually in recent years. **Table 1** summarizes recent Administration budget requests and enacted appropriations for SRF capitalization grants. This table does not include appropriations for congressionally directed special project grants in individual cities (that is, congressional earmarks), which for several years represented about 15% of water infrastructure funds.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> For further information on the clean water SRF program, see CRS Report 98-323, *Wastewater Treatment: Overview and Background*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>23</sup> For additional information, see CRS Report RS22037, *Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF): Program Overview and Issues*, by Mary Tiemann.

<sup>24</sup> Issues associated with special project grants are discussed in CRS Report RL32201, *Water Infrastructure Projects Designated in EPA Appropriations: Trends and Policy Implications*, by Claudia Copeland. Since FY2011, Congress has placed a moratorium on earmarks, but some policymakers favor restoring the practice.

**Table I. Clean Water SRF Capitalization Grants, FY2008-FY2016 Request**  
(millions of dollars)

Fiscal Year	President's Request	Appropriations
2008	687.6	1,083.8
2009	555.0	4,689.1 <sup>a</sup>
2010	2,400.0	2,100.0
2011	2,000.0	1,522.0
2012	1,550.0	1,466.5
2013	1,175.0	1,376.1 <sup>b</sup>
2014	1,095.0	1,448.9
2015	1,018.0	1,448.9
2016	1,116.0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11,596.6</b>	<b>15,135.3</b>

**Source:** Compiled by CRS.

- a. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5) provided \$4.0 billion in supplemental FY2009 appropriations.
- b. FY2013 appropriations reflect post-sequester/post-rescission amount.

One issue of continuing interest is impacts of paying for water infrastructure projects on small communities, many of which have found it difficult to participate in the SRF loan program. This is due to a number of factors. Many are characterized by narrow or weak tax bases, limited or no access to capital markets, lower relative household incomes, higher per capita needs, and limited ability to demonstrate economies of scale. They often find it harder to borrow to meet their capital needs and pay relatively high premiums to do so. Meeting the special needs of small towns, through a reestablished grant program, other funding source, or loan program with special rules, has been an issue of interest to Congress.

Because remaining clean water funding needs are still so large nationally, at issue is whether and how to extend SRF assistance to address those needs, how to allocate SRF funds among the states, and how to prioritize projects and funding. Additionally, there is concern about the adequacy of SRF or other funding specifically for high-cost projects dealing with problems of overflows from municipal combined and separate sewers which can release partially treated or untreated wastewaters that harm public health and the environment. EPA estimates that the cost of projects to control sewer overflows and manage stormwater runoff is nearly \$64 billion nationwide—more than one-fifth of all needs estimated in the most recent Needs Survey. Wastewater utilities also have sought assistance to assess operational vulnerabilities and upgrade physical protection of their facilities against possible terrorist attacks that could threaten the water infrastructure system.<sup>25</sup>

In 2010 EPA issued a “Clean Water and Drinking Water Infrastructure Sustainability Policy” addressing management and pricing of infrastructure funded through SRFs to encourage

<sup>25</sup> For additional information on many of these topics, see CRS Report RL31116, *Water Infrastructure Needs and Investment: Review and Analysis of Key Issues*, by Claudia Copeland and Mary Tiemann.

conservation and provide adequate long-term funding for future capital needs. EPA is working with water utilities to promote planning processes that reflect not only public health and water quality, but also conservation of natural resources and innovative treatment. Further, EPA is working with states to target SRF assistance to projects that focus on system upgrade and replacement in existing communities, reflect full life cycle costs of infrastructure assets, and conserve natural resources or use alternative approaches.

## **Issues Affecting Legislative Efforts**

Congress had considered water infrastructure funding issues several times since the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, but no legislation other than appropriations was enacted until P.L. 113-121, discussed next. Despite specific issues that have stalled legislation, the act's water infrastructure program is widely supported both inside and outside Congress. However, because the House and Senate have focused extensively on reducing federal spending and deficit reduction recently, proposals concerning new or expanded federal spending for water infrastructure investments have not advanced. Throughout this period, several factors contributed to difficulties in moving bills through the legislative process. They included Bush Administration opposition to higher authorization levels, controversies over application of prevailing wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act to water infrastructure projects, and disputes over the formula for allocating clean water SRF grants among the states.

The issue of the applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act to SRF-funded projects has been especially controversial, because that act has both strong supporters and critics in Congress and elsewhere. It requires, among other things, that not less than the locally prevailing wage be paid to workers employed, under contract, on federal construction work "to which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party." Critics of Davis-Bacon say that it unnecessarily increases public construction costs and hampers competition, while supporters say that it helps stabilize the local construction industry by preventing competition that would undercut local wages and working conditions. Under the original SRF program authorization enacted in 1987, the Davis-Bacon Act applied to so-called "first use" monies provided by a state from its SRF (that is, loans made from initial federal capitalization grants, but not to subsequent monies provided from repayments to the SRF). When that authorization expired at the end of FY1994, Davis-Bacon requirements also expired. Thus, the recent issue has been whether to restore the applicability of those requirements.<sup>26</sup> While authorizing committees have debated this issue for some time, Davis-Bacon requirements have been attached to use of SRF funds through appropriations acts since 2009.

A second issue that has complicated enactment of legislation is the method of allocating SRF capitalization grants among the states. CWA Section 205(c)(3) contains a table that identifies each state's percentage share of appropriated funds. Changing the formulation of how funds are distributed matters to every state, because inevitably it results in "winners" and "losers." But because the existing statutory allotment has not been revised since 1987, while needs have changed considerably, the issue is important to considering clean water infrastructure legislation.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> For information, see CRS Report R41469, *Davis-Bacon Prevailing Wages and State Revolving Loan Programs Under the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act*, by Gerald Mayer and Jon O. Shimabukuro.

<sup>27</sup> For additional information on the current statutory formula, see CRS Report RL31073, *Allocation of Wastewater Treatment Assistance: Formula and Other Changes*, by Claudia Copeland.

## WIFIA Pilot Program and SRF Amendments in P.L. 113-121

Most policymakers acknowledge that communities face formidable challenges in providing and paying for adequate and reliable water infrastructure services for their citizens, and Congress has long considered ways to help meet those challenges. Several policy options have been discussed, including some that exist and are well established—such as the SRF program—while some are newer—such as creating a national infrastructure bank. Some are intended to provide long-term revenue to support infrastructure financing programs, and some are intended to encourage private participation in providing wastewater services. At this point, there is no consensus favoring a single policy, and many advocate a combination of options to expand the financing “toolbox.”

One particular option that has been debated is a “Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act,” or WIFIA, program, and legislation to create a WIFIA pilot program was enacted in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress (H.R. 3080/P.L. 113-121). The legislation, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) Title V, Subtitle C, authorizes a five-year WIFIA pilot program. Under the bill, EPA is authorized to provide credit assistance (secured loans or loan guarantees) for drinking water and wastewater projects, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is authorized to provide similar assistance for water resource projects, such as flood control or hurricane and storm damage reduction. Proponents argue that WIFIA offers a number of financing advantages, such as providing credit assistance at low U.S. Treasury rates to projects that otherwise have difficulty obtaining financing, thus lowering the cost of capital to borrowers. Under the legislation, EPA and the Corps each are authorized a total of \$175 million over five years (beginning with \$20 million in FY2015 and increasing to \$50 million in FY2019 for each agency) to provide assistance. Projects must be \$20 million or larger in costs to be eligible, except that projects in rural areas (population 25,000 or less) must have eligible projects costs of \$5 million or more.<sup>28</sup>

Since passage of the legislation, EPA has held a series of meetings around the country to discuss implementation of the new program, as the agency seeks stakeholder views on issues such as how to define eligible projects, develop a project ranking system and evaluation criteria, and determine credit worthiness. However, the program will not proceed until Congress provides appropriations for it. In the FY2015 omnibus appropriations act, enacted in December 2014 (H.R. 83/P.L. 113-235), Congress provided EPA with \$2.2 million for hiring and staffing to implement the new program, but it did not appropriate funds to actually finance projects. The President’s FY2016 budget requests \$5.0 million to continue preparing for implementation but no funds for EPA to begin making loans.

In addition to the WIFIA provisions, P.L. 113-121 includes a number of provisions amending certain water infrastructure provisions of the CWA, especially the Title VI SRF program. Some of the provisions in P.L. 113-121 were included in other legislation and proposals in recent Congresses that have not advanced (such as extending SRF loan repayment from 20 to 30 years, allowing states to make subsidized loans under certain circumstances, adding land acquisition to the definition of “treatment works” in order to be eligible for SRF assistance, and explicitly allowing SRF monies to be used for security projects at wastewater treatment plants). Several of the provisions have been included in recent appropriations bills and are now codified in the CWA by P.L. 113-121 (such as expanding the list of SRF-eligible projects to include energy- and water-

<sup>28</sup> For additional information, see CRS Report R43315, *Water Infrastructure Financing: The Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) Program*, by Claudia Copeland.



efficiency and others; increasing SRF assistance to Indian Tribes; and imposing “Buy American” requirements on SRF assistance). The CWA provisions included in P.L. 113-121 are the first amendments to Title VI since 1987. However, the amendments do not address other long-standing Title VI issues: authorization of appropriations for capitalization grants (i.e., the amendments do not reauthorize clean water SRF grants), state-by-state allocation of capitalization grants (i.e., the allocation formula that has been in effect since 1987), or applicability of prevailing wage requirements under the Davis-Bacon Act (locally prevailing wages are to be paid to workers on projects that receive SRF assistance).<sup>29</sup>

## Other Clean Water Act Issues

A number of other issues affecting efforts to achieve the goals and objectives of the CWA have drawn interest recently and been the subject of congressional oversight and legislation. Some legislators have been highly critical of recent regulatory initiatives, while others have been more supportive of EPA’s implementation efforts.

Since 2009, EPA has proposed and promulgated numerous regulations implementing the CWA and other pollution control statutes that it administers. Critics of the Administration, both within Congress and outside of it, have accused the agency of reaching beyond the authority given it by Congress and ignoring or underestimating the costs and economic impacts of these rules. Majority party leaders in the House conducted vigorous oversight of the agency in the 112<sup>th</sup> and 113<sup>th</sup> Congresses. Bills seeking to overturn specific regulations or to limit the agency’s authority also were introduced, along with proposals to bar EPA funding for specific activities.<sup>30</sup> Environmental groups disagree that the agency has overreached, and EPA itself contends that critics’ focus on the cost of controls obscures the benefits of new regulations. The agency estimates that benefits far exceed the costs, and that investing in pollution control is an important source of economic activity, exports, and American jobs. Although particular attention is being paid to the Clean Air Act, a number of EPA’s initiatives concerning the CWA also have received legislators’ scrutiny.<sup>31</sup> In several cases, policymakers have sought to curtail water quality protection initiatives under the CWA following court rulings that expanded the regulatory scope of the law. In the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, scrutiny of EPA initiatives is widely expected to be intense, including those involving water quality.

## Mountaintop Mining in Appalachia

One water quality issue that has received considerable attention is mountaintop coal mining. Mountaintop removal coal mining involves removing the top of a mountain in order to recover the coal seams contained there. This practice occurs in six Appalachian states (Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and Ohio). It creates an immense quantity of excess spoil, which is typically placed in nearby valleys, burying streams that flow through the valleys. Critics say that, as a result of valley fills, stream water quality and the aquatic and wildlife habitat

<sup>29</sup> For additional information on P.L. 113-121, see CRS Report R43298, *Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014: Comparison of Select Provisions*, by Nicole T. Carter et al.

<sup>30</sup> For discussion of several additional CWA issues considered in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, see CRS Report R42883, *Water Quality Issues in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress: An Overview*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>31</sup> For information, see CRS Report R41561, *EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?*, by James E. McCarthy and Claudia Copeland.

that streams support are destroyed. The mining industry argues that mountaintop mining is essential to conducting surface coal mining in the Appalachian region and that surface coal mining would not be economically feasible there if producers were restricted from using valleys for the disposal of mining overburden.<sup>32</sup>

Mountaintop mining is regulated under several laws, including the CWA Section 404 permit program (discussed above) and the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. In June 2009, officials of EPA, the Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Interior's Office of Surface Mining and Reclamation (OSM) signed a memorandum of understanding outlining a series of administrative actions under these laws to reduce the harmful environmental impacts of mountaintop mining and surface coal mining in Appalachia. The plan includes a series of near-term and longer-term actions that emphasize specific steps, improved coordination, and greater transparency of decisions. The actions are being implemented through regulatory proposals, guidance documents, and review of pending applications for permits to authorize mountaintop mining-valley fill operations. In 2009, the Army Corps suspended the use of a particular CWA general permit (nationwide permit 21) for surface coal mining activities in Appalachia and in 2012 it finalized rules to apply more stringent use of CWA general permits by these coal mining operations.<sup>33</sup>

Also in 2009 EPA and the Corps began conducting detailed evaluations of 79 pending CWA permit applications for surface mining activities in order to limit environmental impacts of the proposed activities under a process called Enhanced Coordination Procedures (ECP). Coal industry groups and coal state officials contended that the ECP process resulted in costly delay in issuance of permits. They challenged the process in federal court, and in October 2011, the court struck down the ECP as an unlawful transfer of legal authority from the Corps to EPA.<sup>34</sup> Thereafter, the agencies continued to review permit applications for surface coal mining projects in Appalachia under existing rules, but not the vacated ECP.

In July 2011 EPA issued guidance on review of CWA Section 402 and 404 permit requests for surface coal mining in Appalachia. The guidance tightened oversight of permit reviews in several ways, most notably by establishing two benchmarks for stream conductivity, which is a measure of the level of salinity in water and is a proxy for dissolved solids in stream waters associated with mining activity that may contribute to toxicity. The guidance has been very controversial with industry. The House Transportation Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held hearings on these issues in May 2011. A hearing also was held by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee in July 2011. In July 2012, the same federal court that struck down the ECP also invalidated the 2011 guidance document intended to help assess a mine's water quality impacts, ruling that EPA had overstepped its statutory authority. The government appealed both of these rulings, which were overturned by a federal appeals court in July 2014.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> For additional information, see CRS Report RS21421, *Mountaintop Mining: Background on Current Controversies*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>33</sup> For information, see CRS Report 97-223, *The Army Corps of Engineers' Nationwide Permits Program: Issues and Regulatory Developments*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>34</sup> At the time of the court's ruling, 8 of the 79 projects under ECP review had received permits; 50 permit applications had been withdrawn by the applicants; 3 project reviews were underway or nearly complete; and 18 reviews had not yet begun.

<sup>35</sup> *National Mining Association v. McCarthy*, D.C. Cir., No. 12-5310, July 11, 2014.

In the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress (as in several prior Congresses), legislation intended to sharply restrict the practice of mountaintop mining was introduced (H.R. 1837, the Clean Water Protection Act). It would have narrowed the CWA definition of “fill material,” and thus narrowed the types of materials that can be discharged into U.S. waters under a Section 404 permit. The significance of the bill is that discharges of materials that are not eligible for a Section 404 permit are regulated under CWA Section 402. Because Section 402 discharge requirements are more restrictive than those for Section 404, some discharges that could be permitted under Section 404 cannot be authorized under Section 402. Supporters favored making it more difficult to use Section 404 to authorize activities that they consider to be environmentally harmful. On the other hand, critics of the legislation say that, as a practical matter, economically important activities such as coal mining could not meet the more stringent limitations of a Section 402 permit and, thus, would be infeasible. Another 113<sup>th</sup> Congress bill, H.R. 526, would have placed a moratorium on permitting for mountain removal coal mining until certain health studies are conducted.<sup>36</sup>

Another aspect of the mountaintop mining issue that has drawn attention is EPA’s 2011 veto of a CWA Section 404 permit for a surface coal mining operation in West Virginia, the Spruce No. 1 mine. EPA’s action has been controversial, particularly because the veto occurred after the permit had been issued by the Army Corps. EPA’s veto of the permit was challenged, and in March 2012, a federal district court overturned the veto, ruling that EPA had exceeded its statutory authority in the Spruce No. 1 action. However, in April 2013, a federal appeals court reversed the lower court’s decision and upheld EPA’s authority to retroactively veto permits.<sup>37</sup> The appeals court ruling was applauded by environmental groups and criticized by the mining industry. In response, bills were introduced to limit or prohibit EPA’s ability to exercise this veto authority, contained in CWA Section 404(c).

Several proposals in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress (H.R. 524/S. 830 and H.R. 1829/S. 861) would have barred EPA from vetoing a 404 permit retroactively. Another bill, S. 2156, would have prohibited retroactive vetoes and also restricted prospective vetoes in advance of a 404 permit application being submitted. Congressional interest in the government’s multiple actions on mountaintop mining—which some critics consider part of a “War on Coal”—continued in 2014 and is likely to be prominent in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress. Bills to restrict EPA’s 404(c) veto authority to up to the time of permit issuance by the Corps have been introduced (S. 55/S. 234 and H.R. 1203).

## Continuing Issue: Appropriations

Although few CWA amendments have been enacted recently, clean water policy and program issues have been addressed regularly by Congress in the context of annual appropriations acts. EPA’s appropriations are included in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations acts.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup> For additional information, see CRS Report RL31411, *Controversies over Redefining “Fill Material” Under the Clean Water Act*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>37</sup> *Mingo Logan Coal Company v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*, 714 F.3d 608 (DC Cir. 2013); *cert. denied*, 134 S. Ct. 1540 (2014). For background on the veto, see CRS Report RS21421, *Mountaintop Mining: Background on Current Controversies*, by Claudia Copeland.

<sup>38</sup> For additional information, see CRS Report 96-647, *Water Infrastructure Financing: History of EPA Appropriations*, by Claudia Copeland.

## FY2015 Appropriations

The Administration's FY2015 budget sought \$7.89 billion overall for EPA (3.6% below the FY2014 enacted level), including \$1.018 billion for clean water SRF capitalization grants, \$15 million for Alaska Native Village and U.S.-Mexico Border water infrastructure projects, and \$1.13 billion for state categorical grants (for water and other state-implemented environmental programs).<sup>39</sup> The total amount requested for clean water SRF capitalization grants was 26% below the FY2014 enacted level (see **Table 1**). Among the state categorical grants, the budget sought 8% more for state clean water pollution control grants (CWA Section 106) and 3.6% more for nonpoint pollution management grants (CWA Section 319). The budget sought no funds for the BEACHES grant program. The request also included \$275 million for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (\$25 million less than in FY2014) and a total of \$119 million for other geographic programs, such as Chesapeake Bay (3% more than these programs received in FY2014).

Congress did not enact FY2015 appropriations before the start of the fiscal year on October 1, but it passed a short-term continuing resolution to provide funding at FY2014 levels through December 11, 2014 (H.J.Res. 124/P.L. 113-164). Before taking that action, the appropriations committees took some action on bills to provide EPA appropriations. In July 2014, the House Appropriations Committee reported H.R. 5171, and in August, a Senate Appropriations subcommittee released a chairman's mark providing recommendations for the FY2015 Interior and Environment Appropriations Act.<sup>40</sup>

Final appropriations were included in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (H.R. 83/P.L. 113-235), enacted in December 2014. The bill includes funds for most EPA water programs at the same level as in FY2014: e.g., \$1.45 billion for clean water SRF capitalization grants and \$300 million for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. It also provides \$159 million for nonpoint pollution management grants (CWA Section 319), \$231 million for state water quality management grants (CWA Section 106), and \$73 million for the Chesapeake Bay program (\$3 million more than FY2014). Generally, these funding levels are higher than were included in the President's FY2015 budget request. The final bill also includes \$9.5 million for the BEACHES grant program, although the Administration had requested no funding for it.

## FY2016 Appropriations

The Administration's FY2016 budget was presented on February 2, 2015. Overall, the budget seeks \$8.6 billion for EPA, or \$452 million more than the FY2015 enacted level of funding. The EPA request includes \$1.116 billion for clean water SRF capitalizations grants (\$333 million less than the FY2015 enacted level; see **Table 1**) and \$15 million for Alaska Native Village and U.S.-Mexico Border water infrastructure projects. The Administration seeks \$238.8 million to protect surface waters (19.5% higher than the FY2015 enacted level), and \$250 million for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (17% below the FY2015 enacted level). The budget seeks increases for several water-quality grant programs (Section 106 grants, Section 319 grants, and wetlands program development grants), but again requests no funding for the BEACHES grant program.

<sup>39</sup> See CRS Report R43709, *Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): FY2015 Appropriations*, by Robert Esworthy.

<sup>40</sup> See <http://www.appropriations.senate.gov/news/fy15-interior-subcommittee-bill-draft-report>.

## **Author Contact Information**

Claudia Copeland  
Specialist in Resources and Environmental Policy  
ccopeland@crs.loc.gov, 7-7227