



DECISION DOCUMENT NATIONWIDE PERMIT 55

This document discusses the factors considered by the Corps of Engineers (Corps) during the issuance process for this Nationwide Permit (NWP). This document contains: (1) the public interest review required by Corps regulations at 33 CFR 320.4(a)(1) and (2); and (2) a discussion of the environmental considerations necessary to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. This evaluation of the NWP includes a discussion of compliance with applicable laws, consideration of public comments, an alternatives analysis, and a general assessment of individual and cumulative environmental effects, including the general potential effects on each of the public interest factors specified at 33 CFR 320.4(a).

1.0 Text of the Nationwide Permit

Seaweed Mariculture Activities. Structures in marine and estuarine waters, including structures anchored to the seabed in waters overlying the outer continental shelf, for seaweed mariculture activities. This NWP also authorizes structures for bivalve shellfish mariculture if shellfish production is a component of an integrated multi-trophic mariculture system (e.g., the production of seaweed and bivalve shellfish on the same structure or a nearby mariculture structure that is part of the single and complete project).

This NWP authorizes the installation of buoys, long-lines, floats, anchors, rafts, racks, and other similar structures into navigable waters of the United States. Rafts, racks and other floating structures must be securely anchored and clearly marked. To the maximum extent practicable, the permittee must remove these structures from navigable waters of the United States if they will no longer be used for seaweed mariculture activities or multi-trophic mariculture activities.

Structures in an anchorage area established by the U.S. Coast Guard must comply with the requirements in 33 CFR 322.5(l)(2). Structures may not be placed in established danger zones or restricted areas designated in 33 CFR part 334, Federal navigation channels, shipping safety fairways or traffic separation schemes established by the U.S. Coast Guard (see 33 CFR 322.5(l)(1)), or EPA or Corps designated open water dredged material disposal areas.

This NWP does not authorize:

(a) The cultivation of an aquatic nuisance species as defined in the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 or the cultivation of a nonindigenous species unless that species has been previously cultivated in the waterbody; or

(b) Attendant features such as docks, piers, boat ramps, stockpiles, or staging areas.

Notification: The permittee must submit a pre-construction notification to the district engineer. (See general condition 32.)

In addition to the information required by paragraph (b) of general condition 32, the preconstruction notification must also include the following information: (1) a map showing the locations and dimensions of the structure(s); (2) the name(s) of the species that will be cultivated during the period this NWP is in effect; and (3) general water depths in the project area(s) (a detailed survey is not required). No more than one pre-construction notification per structure or group of structures should be submitted for the seaweed mariculture operation during the effective period of this NWP. The pre-construction notification should describe all species and culture activities the operator expects to undertake during the effective period of this NWP. (Authority: Section 10)

Note 1: The permittee should notify the applicable U.S. Coast Guard office regarding the project.

Note 2: To prevent introduction of aquatic nuisance species, no material that has been taken from a different waterbody may be reused in the current project area, unless it has been treated in accordance with the applicable regional aquatic nuisance species management plan.

Note 3: The Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 defines “aquatic nuisance species” as “a nonindigenous species that threatens the diversity or abundance of native species or the ecological stability of infested waters, or commercial, agricultural, aquacultural, or recreational activities dependent on such waters.”

1.1 Requirements

General conditions of the NWPs are in the Federal Register notice announcing the issuance of this NWP. Pre-construction notification requirements, additional conditions, limitations, and restrictions are in 33 CFR part 330.

1.2 Statutory Authorities

- Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403)

1.3 Compliance with Related Laws (33 CFR 320.3)

1.3.1 General

Nationwide permits are a type of general permit designed to authorize certain activities that have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects and generally comply with the related laws cited in 33 CFR 320.3. Activities that result in more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects cannot be authorized by NWP. Individual review of each activity authorized by an NWP will not normally be performed, except when pre-construction notification to the Corps is required or when an applicant requests verification that an activity complies with an NWP. Potential adverse impacts and compliance with the laws cited in 33 CFR 320.3 are controlled by the terms and conditions of each NWP, regional and case-specific conditions, and the review process that is undertaken prior to the issuance of NWPs.

The evaluation of this NWP, and related documentation, considers compliance with each of the following laws, where applicable: Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899; Sections 401, 402, and 404 of the Clean Water Act; Section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended; Section 302 of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended; the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; the Migratory Marine Game-Fish Act; the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Federal Power Act of 1920, as amended; the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966; the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; the Endangered Species Act; the Deepwater Port Act of 1974; the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972; Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; the Ocean Thermal Energy Act of 1980; the National Fishing Enhancement Act of 1984; the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation and Management Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act; and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. In addition, compliance of the NWP with other Federal requirements, such as Executive Orders and Federal regulations addressing issues such as floodplains, essential fish habitat, and critical resource waters is considered.

The evaluation of this NWP is largely a qualitative evaluation that utilizes available information on the categories of activities authorized by this NWPs, the potential environmental impacts of those authorized activities, potential mitigation measures, and the potential benefits of the authorized activities. The Council on Environmental Quality's regulations at 50 CFR parts 1500 to 1508 for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act do not require quantitative analyses for environmental assessments. Since this NWP authorizes activities across the United States, this environmental assessment uses, available national information supplemented with other available information.

1.3.2 Terms and Conditions

Many NWP's have pre-construction notification requirements that trigger case-by-case review of certain activities. Two NWP general conditions require case-by-case review of all activities that may adversely affect federally-listed endangered or threatened species or historic properties (i.e., general conditions 18 and 20, respectively). General condition 16 restricts the use of NWP's for activities that are located in federally-designated wild and scenic rivers. None of the NWP's authorize the construction of artificial reefs. General condition 28 addresses the use of an NWP with other NWP's to authorize a single and complete project, to ensure that the acreage limits of each of the NWP's used to authorize that project are not exceeded.

In some cases, activities authorized by an NWP may require other federal, state, or local authorizations. Examples of such cases include, but are not limited to: activities that are in marine sanctuaries or affect marine sanctuaries or marine mammals; the ownership, construction, location, and operation of ocean thermal conversion facilities or deep water ports beyond the territorial seas; activities that result in discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States and require Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification; or activities in a state operating under a coastal zone management program approved by the Secretary of Commerce under the Coastal Zone Management Act. In such cases, a provision of the NWP's states that an NWP does not obviate the need to obtain other authorizations required by law. [33 CFR 330.4(b)(2)]

Additional safeguards include provisions that allow the Chief of Engineers, division engineers, and/or district engineers to: assert discretionary authority and require an individual permit for a specific activity; modify NWP's for specific activities by adding special conditions on a case-by-case basis; add conditions on a regional or nationwide basis to certain NWP's; or take action to suspend or revoke an NWP or NWP authorization for activities within a region or state. Regional conditions are imposed to protect important regional concerns and resources. [33 CFR 330.4(e) and 330.5]

1.3.3 Review Process

The analyses in this document and the coordination that was undertaken prior to the issuance of the NWP fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and other acts promulgated to protect the quality of the environment.

All NWP's that authorize activities that may result in discharges into waters of the United States require compliance with the water quality certification requirements of Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Nationwide permits that authorize activities within, or affecting land or water uses within a state that has a Federally-approved coastal zone management program, must also be certified as consistent with the state's program, unless a presumption of concurrence occurs. The procedures to ensure that the NWP's comply with these laws are described in 33 CFR 330.4(c)

and (d), respectively.

1.4 Public Comments and Responses

For a summary of the public comments received in response to the September 15, 2020, Federal Register notice, refer to the preamble in the Federal Register notice announcing the issuance of this NWP. The substantive comments received in response to the September 15, 2020, Federal Register notice were used to improve the NWP by changing NWP terms and limits, notification requirements, and/or NWP general conditions, as necessary.

The Corps proposed this new NWP as NWP A, to authorize structures in navigable waters of the United States, including federal waters over the outer continental shelf, for seaweed mariculture activities. In the first sentence of this NWP, the Corps added “and estuarine” to make this NWP consistent with proposed new NWP B for finfish mariculture activities with respect to the waters in which these two NWPs may be used to authorize activities under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. The omission of “and estuarine” in the proposed NWP A was a drafting error.

The Corps removed the phrase “and work” from this NWP because this NWP only authorizes structures, and this NWP does not authorize any of the operational aspects of seaweed mariculture activities. The operation of a seaweed mariculture facility does not constitute “work” as that term is defined at 33 CFR 322.2(c) for the purposes of Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Section 322.2(c) defines “work” as “any dredging or disposal of dredged material, excavation, filling, or other modification of a navigable water of the United States.” After the seaweed mariculture structure is installed, subsequent operations to produce seaweed do not physically modify navigable waters of the United States in a manner that would be considered “work” under the Act

Several commenters expressed support for the issuance of new NWP A. One commenter suggested combining NWPs 48 and A into one NWP instead of issuing separate NWPs. One commenter said that issuing NWP A would reduce barriers to entry for seaweed mariculture activities. Another commenter supported the issuance of NWP A because kelp and seaweed are winter crops, and would help provide year-round revenue sources for coastal commercial communities. A few commenters expressed support for NWP A because growth of marine plants improves water quality and provides ecosystem services.

The Corps is keeping NWPs 48 and proposed new NWP A separate because NWP 48 activities occur primarily in nearshore waters and NWP A can be used to authorize activities in both nearshore waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf. The Corps acknowledges the economic benefits of providing an NWP to authorize seaweed mariculture activities that result in no more than minimal

adverse environmental effects, as well as the ecological benefits that may be provided by the cultivated seaweeds, such as water quality benefits through the assimilation of nutrients and habitat benefits for some aquatic species.

Several commenters said they support the inclusion of multi-trophic species production in NWP A. One commenter supported including multi-trophic species production as long as it is voluntary and not a requirement of the NWP. One commenter said that multi-trophic activities should not be authorized under an NWP until an industry standard has been established. A few commenters stated multi-trophic activities should be authorized under by individual permits to provide an appropriate level of environmental review. One commenter said PCNs including that multi-trophic activities should be coordinated with states. A few commenters asserted that the text of NWP A should clarify that multi-trophic activities do not include finfish cultivation. One commenter stated that multi-trophic species mariculture could attract protected species and result in greater risk of entanglement. A few commenters said that the NWPs are appropriate only for activities with more predictable outcomes and should not be used for experimental industries.

The Corps has retained multi-tropic mariculture activities in this NWP, to provide authorization for mariculturists that want to grow seaweeds and bivalves on the same structures. Conducting multi-tropic mariculture activities is optional, and a grower can choose to only cultivate seaweeds. District engineers will review PCNs for proposed NWP A activities to ensure that those activities will result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. If the district engineer reviews a PCN and determines that the adverse environmental effects will be more than minimal after considering any mitigation proposed by the applicant, he or she will exercise discretionary authority and require an individual permit. The Corps does not believe it is necessary to require coordination of proposed multi-tropic mariculture activities with states, but district engineers can informally coordinate PCNs with states if they believe it is appropriate to do so. If a mariculturist wants to grow finfish as part of a multi-trophic mariculture operation, she or he should use NWP B (which, as discussed below, is issued in this final rule as NWP 56), which authorizes multi-trophic mariculture activities involving finfish, seaweeds, and/or bivalves. There may be some risk of entanglement or other forms of adverse impact in lines used for seaweed mariculture activities, and that risk will be evaluated by district engineers during the PCN review process. If the risk of entanglement applies to ESA-listed species, the district engineer will conduct ESA section 7 consultation with the U.S. FWS and/or NMFS as appropriate. Multi-trophic mariculture activities have been conducted for a number of years in other countries (Largo et al. 2016, Troell et al. 2009).

Several commenters said NWP A should not be issued because these activities will result in more than minimal individual or cumulative adverse environmental effects. Several commenters stated NWP A should not be issued because the long-term cumulative impacts are unknown. Many commenters expressed concern with the

issuance of an NWP authorizing seaweed mariculture activities because of the relative unknown impacts and risks associated with these activities. One commenter said that the social, economic, and environmental impacts from seaweed mariculture are unknown. One commenter said that the cumulative impact from the varying scale of aquaculture systems cannot sufficiently be addressed under an NWP. Many commenters stated that there is not sufficient information available to inform whether NWP A would cause no more than minimal impacts. A few commenters said that the Corps has not demonstrated that NWP A complies with the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) guidelines.

The Corps has issued this NWP after considering information on its relatively small, if not beneficial, impact on marine ecosystems and including mechanisms (e.g., PCNs required for all proposed activities) to ensure that it authorizes only those seaweed mariculture activities that result in minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. In response to a PCN, district engineers will apply the 10 criteria listed in paragraph 2 of Section D, District Engineer's Decision to determine whether the proposed activity can be authorized by NWP 55, with or without additional permit conditions. Division engineers may modify, suspend, or revoke this NWP on a regional basis in accordance with the procedures at 33 CFR 330.5(c). The Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines do not apply to activities authorized by this NWP because it only authorizes structures or work in navigable waters of the United States under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. It does not authorize activities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Several commenters said that NWP A would impact tribal rights and treaty protected fishing grounds. One commenter requested additional information and formal government-to-government consultation on proposed new NWP A. One commenter objected to the issuance of NWP A because it does not include required mitigation measures. One commenter stated that mitigation measures should be considered for ESA-listed species and tribal cultural and fishing issues. One commenter suggested adding minimization measures to NWP A that are currently in place in states that are already practicing seaweed mariculture operations.

Activities authorized by NWP A must comply with general condition 17, tribal rights. During the rulemaking process for the issuance of this NWP, district engineers have been conducting consultation and coordination with tribes to identify regional conditions and coordination procedures to facilitate compliance with general condition 17. In response to a PCN, a district engineer can require mitigation measures to help ensure that the authorized activity results in only minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. During the development of this NWP, the Corps did not identify any mitigation measures that should be added to this NWP, other than the general conditions that apply to all NWPs. Mitigation measures for ESA-listed species are more appropriately identified during the ESA section 7 consultation process. If states have developed mitigation measures for seaweed mariculture activities, division engineers can consider adding those

mitigation measures as regional conditions to this NWP.

Several commenters said that NWP A should include a PCN requirement. One commenter expressed support for requiring PCNs for new seaweed mariculture operations. One commenter said that PCNs should not be required if existing permitted bivalve shellfish farms want to add seaweed into their operations. One commenter stated that the U.S. Coast Guard be notified before issuing an NWP A verification. One commenter recommended requiring the PCN to include information identifying the proposed location of operations to review competing stakeholder uses. One commenter said that all PCNs for these activities must identify all gear specifications, production duration, stocking and harvesting times, and gear modifications related to avoiding or mitigating protected species interactions. Many commenters stated that PCNs for NWP A activities should require documentation of compliance with specific design and operational standards. One commenter said PCNs required for these activities should include information the performance of anchoring systems during severe weather events to minimize damage or loss. One commenter said that PCNs for these activities should state which commercial fisheries activities (wild or mariculture) might have the potential to be affected by the proposed activity or include a vicinity map indicating the location of the proposed activities.

Proposed new NWP A requires PCNs for all proposed activities. Project proponents may be required to notify the U.S. Coast Guard or comply with U.S. Coast Guard requirements for marking or lighting these structures. It is not the responsibility of the Corps to notify the U.S. Coast Guard of these activities. Some Corps districts have developed local coordination procedures with the U.S. Coast Guard. Paragraph (b)(2) of general condition 32 requires the PCN to include the location of the proposed activity. The Corps does not have the authority to regulate production duration and stocking and harvesting times. If the project proponent wants to modify the seaweed mariculture structures that are regulated under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, he or she must notify the district engineer to request a modification of the NWP verification. Corps district regulatory staff do not have the legal authority or technical expertise to evaluate design or operational standards, or the structural integrity of the seaweed mariculture structures. It is the responsibility of the permittee to properly design the seaweed mariculture structures and ensure that they are properly maintained in accordance with general condition 14, proper maintenance. The Corps declines to require the PCN to identify which commercial fisheries species might be affected by the proposed seaweed mariculture activity because impacts to EFH are already considered when district engineers review PCNs and conduct EFH consultation with NMFS when they determine proposed NWP activities may adversely affect EFH.

Many commenters said that seaweed mariculture activities should require individual permits. Several of these commenters stated that individual permits for these activities are appropriate because the public notice process would allow ample coordination with the affected public. A few commenters said that there is

insufficient industry standardization within mariculture systems to issue an NWP for these activities and these activities should require individual permits. A few commenters said that individual permits should be required for these activities to allow proper environmental review and coordination with state natural resource agencies.

The Corps believes that there are seaweed mariculture activities requiring authorization under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 that will cause only minimal individual and cumulative environmental effects (see 33 CFR 322.2(f)) and are appropriate for authorization by NWP. If a district engineer reviews a PCN for a proposed seaweed mariculture activity and determines that the adverse environmental effects will be more than minimal after considering mitigation proposed by the applicant, he or she will exercise discretionary authority and require an individual permit for the proposed activity. In addition, division engineers have the authority to modify, suspend, or revoke this NWP on a regional basis in response to concerns for the aquatic environment or for any factor of the public interest (see 33 CFR 330.1(d)). The development of industry standards is not a prerequisite for NWP authorization, and many activities that have long been authorized NWP do not have any industry standards.

A few commenters stated that NWP A should require agency coordination under paragraph (d) of NWP general condition 32. One commenter said that NWP A PCNs should be coordinated with federal and state natural resource agencies of adjacent states and that applicable state permits must be obtained prior to the Corps issuing an NWP verification for seaweed mariculture activities. Many commenters said that seaweed mariculture activities should be coordinated with state resource agencies and the public.

The activities authorized by this NWP may require consultation or coordination with the U.S. FWS or NMFS. Consultation with the U.S. FWS and/or NMFS is required for proposed activities that the district engineer determines “may affect” listed species or designated critical habitat. Essential fish habitat consultation with the NMFS is required for any proposed activity that the district engineer determines “may adversely affect” essential fish habitat. Corps districts may develop informal coordination procedures with state resource agencies. Activities authorized by NWPs do not involve coordination with the public. Coordination with the public is only required for activities authorized by standard individual permits.

One commenter said that seaweed mariculture activities authorized by NWP A should be limited to small scale projects. One commenter recommended adding a 1/2-acre limit to this NWP. One commenter stated that seaweed mariculture facilities for biofuels production are in the range of over 1,000 hectares and issuing an NWP to authorize seaweed mariculture activities at that scale would not sufficiently consider the environmental risks. One commenter said that the necessary spatial arrays required for seaweed mariculture would cause conflicts from multiple existing offshore uses.

The Corps does not agree that this NWP should be limited to small-scale project or activities less than 1/2-acre in size. If a project proponent submits a PCN for a large-scale seaweed mariculture activity, and the district engineer determines the proposed activity will result in more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects, he or she will exercise discretionary authority and require an individual permit for the proposed activity. During the evaluation of the PCN, the district engineer will evaluate potential conflicts in resource uses, in accordance with the public interest review factors identified in 33 CFR 320.4(a).

Many commenters stated that the seaweed species to be grown should be the same indigenous genetic stock as found in the waters of the proposed seaweed mariculture activity. One commenter said that the terms and conditions of the proposed NWP address the introduction of non-native species but not the role that mariculture may play in the role of further spreading invasive or aquatic nuisance species. One commenter stated that NWP A should impose rigorous operation emergency response standards. One commenter stated that NWP A should have clear requirements for removing derelict structures.

The Corps has modified this NWP to state that it prohibits the cultivation of an aquatic nuisance species as defined in the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 or the cultivation of a nonindigenous species unless that species has been previously cultivated in the waterbody. Invasive or aquatic nuisance species can spread or be introduced into new areas through a variety of mechanisms, and the Corps does not have the authority to prevent the spread or introduction of those species through those other mechanisms. General condition 13 requires, to the maximum extent practicable, the removal of temporary structures from navigable waters after their use has been discontinued. For permanent structures, the Corps has added a provision to this NWP to require the permittee to remove these structures from navigable waters of the United States when those structures will no longer be used for finfish mariculture activities or multi-trophic mariculture activities.

One commenter recommended requiring the siting of NWP A activities at least 200 meters away from corals, seagrass beds, mangroves, critical habitat, and migration pathways. A few commenters asserted that seaweed mariculture activities are known to impair water quality, and special aquatic sites such as coral, seagrass, and mangroves are especially susceptible to water quality impacts. A few commenters said that seaweed mariculture facilities should not be permitted near sensitive habitat areas or near marine protected areas. One Commenter remarked that seaweed mariculture activities could result in economic impacts to the region where these activities are located by interfering with commercial and recreational fishing activities. One commenter said that operations of seaweed mariculture activities could result in aesthetic impacts to the region. One commenter expressed concerns with potential impacts on navigation and public uses of the waterbody that may be caused by seaweed mariculture activities. One commenter stated that

seaweed mariculture facilities should be distant from areas used by the public. One commenter said that NWP A should be revised to recognize that some state boundaries may extend beyond three nautical miles from shore.

Based on the characteristics of regional ecosystems, division engineers can add regional conditions to this NWP to site NWP A activities specific distances from aquatic resources or areas that may warrant additional protection, such as corals, seagrass beds, mangroves, critical habitat, and migration pathways. Seaweed mariculture activities cultivate macroalgae that take up nitrogen and phosphorous and other nutrients from the water column and generally are understood to improve water quality. Organic matter may be sloughed off of the cultivated seaweeds, which can provide nutrients for benthic communities. The seaweed grown at seaweed mariculture facilities can provide economic benefits such as biofuels, food ingredients, and pharmaceuticals. When reviewing PCNs, district engineers will evaluate potential conflicts in use of navigable waters, such as fishing, recreational, and military uses, as well as potential impacts to aesthetics in the project area. Activities authorized by this NWP must comply with general condition 1, navigation. Navigable waters are available for a variety of public uses, as well as various types of activities authorized for private use. Activities authorized for private use often involve structures that require DA authorization under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which may include structures for seaweed mariculture activities. The variability in state boundaries for the purposes of identifying the territorial seas does not warrant any specific changes to NWP 55.

One commenter stated that shellfish farming activities are known to spread pathogens and the proposed NWP would not sufficiently address environmental concerns for offshore systems. A few commenters said seaweed mariculture facilities should not be permitted to use pesticides, herbicides, or pharmaceuticals. One commenter said that existing shellfish mariculture facilities permitted under NWP 48 should continue to be authorized under NWP 48 rather than authorized by NWP A. One commenter stated it would be more appropriate if seaweed was included under NWP 48 because bivalves are typically the primary cultivated species.

The Corps does not have the authority to take actions to control the spread of pathogens. Pathogens can spread through a variety of mechanisms in open systems such as oceans and estuaries. In addition, the Corps does not have the authority to regulate the use of pesticides, herbicides, and pharmaceuticals that might be used in seaweed mariculture activities. In this final rule, the Corps has issued separate NWPs for commercial shellfish mariculture activities and seaweed mariculture activities. Under NWP A bivalves can be grown with seaweeds are part of a multi-tropic mariculture activity.

A few commenters said that proposed new NWP A would have impacts on ESA-listed species and designated critical habitat. One commenter stated that ESA Section 7 consultation should be mandatory for all seaweed mariculture projects.

One commenter said that incidental take permits under the ESA should be obtained before district engineers issue NWP verifications for these activities. A few commenters said that NWP A activities should have severe consequences for non-compliance, including revocation of the NWP authorization.

Activities authorized by this NWP must comply with general condition 18, endangered species. District engineers will review PCNs for proposed seaweed mariculture activities and if the district engineer determines the proposed activity may affect listed species or designated critical habitat, he or she will conduct ESA section 7 consultation with the U.S. FWS or NMFS as appropriate. If the district engineer initiates section 7 consultation with the U.S. FWS or NMFS, the NWP verification cannot be issued until that consultation is completed. District engineers will also take appropriate actions to address non-compliance with the conditions in NWP A.

2.0 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is the issuance of this NWP to authorize structures in navigable waters of the United States, including federal waters on the outer continental shelf, for seaweed mariculture activities that result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. This proposed action is needed for efficient implementation of the Corps Regulatory Program, by authorizing with little, if any, delay or paperwork this category of activities, when those activities have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. Issuing an NWP to authorize activities that have no more than minimal adverse environmental effects instead of processing individual permit applications for these activities, reduces regulatory burdens on the public, benefits the environment through reduced losses of jurisdictional waters and wetlands, and allows the Corps to allocate more of its resources towards evaluating proposed activities requiring authorization under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 that have the potential to cause more substantial adverse environmental effects.

3.0 Alternatives

This evaluation includes an analysis of alternatives based on the requirements of NEPA. The alternatives discussed below are based on an analysis of the potential environmental impacts and impacts to the Corps, federal, tribal, and state resource agencies, general public, and prospective permittees. The alternatives analysis discussed below consists of a general NEPA alternatives analysis for the NWP.

3.1 No Action Alternative (Do Not Issue the Nationwide Permit)

Under the no action alternative, the Corps would not issue this NWP. Individual permits issued under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 would be required for seaweed mariculture activities, unless Corps districts issued regional general permits to authorize a similar category of activities.

3.2 Issue the Nationwide Permit With Modifications

This alternative consists of issuing the NWP while considering the comments received in response to the proposal to issue this NWP with modifications, including the proposed changes identified by the Corps and changes suggested by commenters. This alternative includes changes to the terms and conditions of this NWP, including quantitative limits for this NWP, pre-construction notification thresholds and requirements, and other provisions of this NWP. This alternative also includes consideration of modifying, adding, or removing general conditions that apply to this NWP. In addition, this alternative includes the mechanisms in the Corps' NWP program regulations at 33 CFR 330.5(c) and (d) where division and district engineers can modify, suspend, or revoke NWP authorizations on a regional or case-by-case basis to ensure that the NWP authorizes only those activities that result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. In the September 15, 2020, Federal Register notice, the Corps requested comments on the proposed issuance of this NWP.

Since the Corps' NWP program began in 1977, the Corps has continuously strived to develop NWPs that only authorize activities that result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. Every five years the Corps reevaluates the NWPs during the reissuance process, and may modify an NWP to address concerns for the aquatic environment. Utilizing collected data and institutional knowledge concerning activities authorized by the Corps regulatory program, the Corps reevaluates the potential impacts of activities authorized by NWPs. The Corps also uses substantive public comments on proposed NWPs to assess the expected impacts.

3.3 Issue the Nationwide Permit Without Modifications

This alternative consists of issuing the NWP as it was proposed in the September 15, 2020, proposal. This alternative also includes the mechanisms in the Corps' NWP program regulations where division and district engineers can modify, suspend, or revoke NWP authorizations on a regional or case-by-case basis to ensure that the NWP authorizes only those activities that result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects (see 33 CFR 330.5(c) and (d)).

4.0 Affected Environment

This environmental assessment is national in scope because the NWP may be used across the country, unless the NWP is revoked or suspended by a division or district engineer under the procedures in 33 CFR 330.5(c) and (d), respectively. For this NWP, the affected environment consists of aquatic ecosystems, including marine and estuarine ecosystems, in the United States, as they have been directly and indirectly affected by past and present federal, non-federal, and private activities. The past and present activities include activities authorized by the various NWPs issued from 1977 to 2017, activities authorized by other types of Department of the Army (DA) permits, as well as other federal, tribal, state, and private activities that are not regulated by the Corps. Aquatic ecosystems are also influenced by past and present activities in uplands, because those land use/land cover changes in uplands and other activities in uplands have indirect effects on aquatic ecosystems (e.g., MEA 2005a, Reid 1993). Due to the large geographic scale of the affected environment (i.e., the entire United States), as well as the many past and present human activities that have shaped the affected environment, it is only practical to describe the affected environment in general terms. In addition, it is not possible to describe the environmental conditions for specific sites where the NWPs may be used to authorize eligible activities.

The total land area in the United States is approximately 2,260,000,000 acres, and the total land area in the contiguous United States is approximately 1,891,000,000 acres (Bigelow and Borchers 2017). Land uses in the United States as of 2012 is provided in Table 4.1 (Bigelow and Borchers 2017). Of the land area in the entire United States, approximately 60 percent (1,370,000,000 acres) is privately owned (Bigelow and Borchers 2017). Of the remaining lands in the United States, the federal government hold 28 percent (644,000,000 acres), state and local governments own 8 percent (189,000,000 acres), and 3 percent (63,000,000 acres) is held in trust by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Bigelow and Borchers 2017).

Table 4.1. Major land uses in the United States – 2012 (Bigelow and Borchers 2017).

Land Use	Acres	Percent of Total
Agriculture	1,186,000,000	52.5
Forest land	502,000,000	22.2
Transportation use	27,000,000	1.2
Recreation and wildlife areas	254,000,000	11.2
National defense areas	27,000,000	1.2
Urban land	70,000,000	3.1
Miscellaneous use	196,000,000	8.5
Total land area	2,260,000,000	100.0

4.1 Quantity of Aquatic Ecosystems in the United States

There are approximately 283.1 million acres of wetlands in the United States; 107.7 million acres are in the conterminous United States and the remaining 175.4 million acres are in Alaska (Mitsch and Hernandez 2013). Wetlands occupy less than 9 percent of the global land area (Zedler and Kercher 2005). According to Dahl (2011), wetlands and deepwater habitats cover approximately 8 percent of the land area in the conterminous United States. Rivers and streams comprise approximately 0.52 percent of the total land area of the continental United States (Butman and Raymond 2011). Therefore, the wetlands, streams, rivers, and other aquatic habitats that are potentially waters of the United States and subject to regulation by the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 comprise a minor proportion of the land area of the United States. The remaining land area of the United States (more than 92 percent, depending on the proportion of wetlands, streams, rivers, and other aquatic habitats that are subject to regulation under those two statutes) is outside the Corps regulatory authority.

Framer et al. (1983) evaluated wetland status and trends in the United States during the period of the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s. During that 20-year period, approximately 7.9 million acres of wetlands (4.2 percent) were lost in the conterminous United States. Much of the loss of estuarine emergent wetlands was due to changes to estuarine subtidal deepwater habitat, and some loss of estuarine emergent wetlands was due to urban development.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also examined the status and trends of wetlands in the United States during the period of the mid-1970s to the 1980s, and found that there was a net loss of more than 2.6 million acres of wetlands (2.5 percent) during that time period (Dahl and Johnson 1991). Freshwater wetlands comprised 98 percent of those wetland losses (Dahl and Johnson 1991). During that time period, losses of estuarine wetlands were estimated to be 71,000 acres, with most of that loss due to changes of emergent estuarine wetlands to open waters caused by shifting sediments (Dahl and Johnson 1991).

Between 2004 and 2009, there was no statistically significant difference in wetland acreage in the conterminous United States (Dahl 2011). According to the 2011 wetland status and trends report, during the period of 2004 to 2009 urban development accounted for 11 percent of wetland losses (61,630 acres), rural development resulted in 12 percent of wetland losses (66,940 acres), silviculture accounted for 56 percent of wetland losses (307,340 acres), and wetland conversion to deepwater habitats caused 21 percent of the loss in wetland area (115,960 acres) (Dahl 2011). Some of the losses occurred to wetlands that are not subject to Clean Water Act jurisdiction and some losses are due to activities not regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, such as unregulated drainage activities, exempt forestry activities, or water withdrawals. From 2004 to 2009, approximately 100,020 acres of wetlands were gained as a result of wetland

restoration and conservation programs on agricultural land (Dahl 2011). Another source of wetland gain is conversion of other uplands to wetlands, resulting in a gain of 389,600 acres during the period of 2004 to 2009 (Dahl 2011). Inventories of wetlands, streams, and other aquatic resources are incomplete because the techniques used for those studies cannot identify some of those resources (e.g., Dahl (2011) for wetlands; Meyer and Wallace (2001) for streams).

Losses of vegetated estuarine wetlands due to the direct effects of human activities have decreased significantly due to the requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and other laws and regulations (Dahl 2011). During the period of 2004 to 2009, less than one percent of estuarine emergent wetlands were lost as a direct result of human activities, while other factors such as sea level rise, land subsidence, storm events, erosion, and other ocean processes caused substantial losses of estuarine wetlands (Dahl 2011). The indirect effects of other human activities, such as oil and gas development, water extraction, development of the upper portions of watersheds, and levees, have also resulted in coastal wetland losses (Dahl 2011). Eutrophication of coastal waters can also cause losses of emergent estuarine wetlands, through changes in growth patterns of marsh plants and decreases in the stability of the wetland substrate, which changes those marshes to mud flats (Deegan et al. 2012).

The Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-645) requires the USFWS to submit wetland status and trends reports to Congress (Dahl 2011). The latest status and trends report, which covers the period of 2004 to 2009, is summarized in Table 4.2. The USFWS status and trends report only provides information on acreage of the various aquatic habitat categories and does not assess the quality or condition of those aquatic habitats (Dahl 2011).

Table 4.2. Estimated aquatic resource acreages in the conterminous United States in 2009 (Dahl 2011).

Aquatic Habitat Category	Estimated Area in 2009 (acres)
Marine intertidal	227,800
Estuarine intertidal non-vegetated	1,017,700
Estuarine intertidal vegetated	4,539,700
All intertidal waters and wetlands	5,785,200
Freshwater ponds	6,709,300
Freshwater vegetated	97,565,300
• Freshwater emergent wetlands	27,430,500
• Freshwater shrub wetlands	18,511,500
• Freshwater forested wetlands	51,623,300
All freshwater wetlands	104,274,600
Lacustrine deepwater habitats	16,859,600
Riverine deepwater habitats	7,510,500
Estuarine subtidal habitats	18,776,500
All wetlands and deepwater habitats	153,206,400

The acreage of lacustrine deepwater habitats does not include the open waters of Great Lakes (Dahl 2011).

The Federal Geographic Data Committee has established the Cowardin system developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (Cowardin et al. 1979) as the national standard for wetland mapping, monitoring, and data reporting (Dahl 2011) (see Federal Geographic Data Committee (2013)). The Cowardin system is a hierarchical system which describes various wetland and deepwater habitats, using structural characteristics such as vegetation, substrate, and water regime as defining characteristics. Wetlands are defined by plant communities, soils, or inundation or flooding frequency. Deepwater habitats are permanently flooded areas located below the wetland boundary. In rivers and lakes, deepwater habitats are usually more than two meters deep. The Cowardin et al. (1979) definition of “wetland” differs from the definition used by the Corps and U.S. EPA for the purposes of implementing Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Corps-U.S. EPA regulations defines wetlands as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.” [33 CFR 328.3(c)(4); 40 CFR 230.3(o)(3)(iv)] The Cowardin et al. (1979) requires only one factor (i.e., wetland vegetation, soils, hydrology) to be present for an area to be a wetland, while the Corps-U.S. EPA

wetland definition requires all three factors to be present under normal circumstances (Tiner 2017, Mitsch and Gosselink 2015). The NWI produced by applying the Cowardin et al. (1979) definition is the only national scale wetland inventory available. There is no national inventory of wetland acreage based on the Corps' wetland definition at 33 CFR 328.3(c)(16).

There are five major systems in the Cowardin classification scheme: marine, estuarine, riverine, lacustrine, and palustrine (Cowardin et al. 1979). The marine system consists of open ocean on the continental shelf and its high energy coastlines. The estuarine system consists of tidal deepwater habitats and adjacent tidal wetlands that are usually partially enclosed by land, but may have open connections to open ocean waters. The riverine system generally consists of all wetland and deepwater habitats located within a river channel. The lacustrine system generally consists of wetland and deepwater habitats located within a topographic depression or dammed river channel, with a total area greater than 20 acres. The palustrine system generally includes all non-tidal wetlands and wetlands located in tidal areas with salinities less than 0.5 parts per thousand; it also includes ponds less than 20 acres in size. Approximately 95 percent of wetlands in the conterminous United States are freshwater wetlands, and the remaining 5 percent are estuarine or marine wetlands (Dahl 2011).

The National Resources Inventory (NRI) is a statistical survey conducted by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) (USDA 2018) of natural resources on non-federal land in the United States. The NRCS defines non-federal land as privately owned lands, tribal and trust lands, and lands under the control of local and state governments. Acreages of palustrine and estuarine wetlands and the land uses those wetlands are subjected to are summarized in Table 4.3. The 2015 NRI estimates that there are 110,638,500 acres of palustrine and estuarine wetlands on non-Federal land and water areas in the United States (USDA 2018). The 2015 NRI estimates that there are 49,598,800 acres of open waters on non-Federal land in the United States, including lacustrine, riverine, and marine habitats, as well as estuarine deepwater habitats.

Table 4.3. The 2015 National Resources Inventory acreages for palustrine and estuarine wetlands on non-federal land, by land cover/use category (USDA 2018).

National Resources Inventory Land Cover/Use Category	Area of Palustrine and Estuarine Wetlands (acres)
cropland, pastureland, and Conservation Reserve Program land	17,300,000
forest land	65,800,000
rangeland	7,800,000
other rural land	14,600,000
developed land	1,500,000
water area	3,600,000
Total	111,000,000

The land cover/use categories used by the 2015 NRI are defined below (USDA 2018). Croplands are areas used to produce crops grown for harvest. Pastureland is land managed for livestock grazing, through the production of introduced forage plants. Conservation Reserve Program land is under a Conservation Reserve Program contract. Forest land is comprised of at least 10 percent single stem woody plant species that will be at least 13 feet tall at maturity. Rangeland is land on which plant cover consists mostly of native grasses, herbaceous plants, or shrubs suitable for grazing or browsing, and introduced forage plant species. Other rural land consists of farmsteads and other farm structures, field windbreaks, marshland, and barren land. Developed land is comprised of large urban and built-up areas (i.e., urban and built-up areas 10 acres or more in size), small built-up areas (i.e., developed lands 0.25 to 10 acres in size), and rural transportation land (e.g., roads, railroads, and associated rights-of-way outside urban and built-up areas). Water areas are comprised of waterbodies and streams that are permanent open waters.

The wetlands data from the Fish and Wildlife Service’s Status and Trends study and the Natural Resources Conservation Service’s National Resources Inventory should not be compared, because they use different methods and analyses to produce their results (Dahl 2011).

Activities authorized by NWPs will adversely affect a smaller proportion of the Nation’s wetland base than indicated by the wetlands acreage estimates provided in the most recent status and trends report, or the NWI maps for a particular region.

Not all wetlands, streams, and other types of aquatic resources are subject to federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act (Mitsch and Gosselink 2015). Two U.S. Supreme Court decisions have identified limits to Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

In 2001, in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. Army Corps of Engineers* (531 U.S. 159) the U.S. Supreme Court held that the use of isolated, non-navigable, intrastate waters by migratory birds is not, by itself a sufficient basis for exercising federal regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act (see 80 FR 37056). In the Supreme Court's 2006 decision in *Rapanos v. United States*, (547 U.S. 715), one justice stated that waters and wetlands regulated under the Clean Water Act must have a "significant nexus" to downstream traditional navigable waters. Four justices (the plurality) concluded that Clean Water Act jurisdiction applies only to relatively permanent waters connected to traditional navigable waters and to wetlands that have a continuous surface connection to those relatively permanent waters. The remaining justices in *Rapanos* stated that Clean Water Act jurisdiction applies to waters and wetlands that meet either the significant nexus test or the Plurality's test.

There are 94,133 miles of shoreline in the United States (NOAA 1975). Of that shoreline, 88,633 miles are tidal shoreline and 5,500 miles are shoreline along the Great Lakes and rivers that connect those lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. More recently, Gittman et al. (2015) estimated that there are 99,524 miles of tidal shoreline in the conterminous United States.

4.2 Quality of Aquatic Ecosystems in the United States

The USFWS status and trends study does not assess the condition or quality of wetlands and deepwater habitats (Dahl 2011). Information on water quality in waters and wetlands, as well as the causes of water quality impairment, is collected by the U.S. EPA under Sections 305(b) and 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. Table 4.4 provides U.S. EPA's most recent national summary of water quality in the Nation's waters and wetlands.

Table 4.4. National summary of water quality data (U.S. EPA, https://iaspub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_nation_cy.control accessed 11/27/2020).

Category of water	Total waters	Total waters assessed	Percent of waters assessed	Good waters	Threatened waters	Impaired waters
Rivers and streams	3,533,205 miles	1,110,961 miles	31.4	518,293 miles	4,495 miles	588,173 miles
Lakes, reservoirs and ponds	41,666,049 acres	18,629,795 acres	44.7	5,390,570 acres	30,309 acres	13,208,917 acres
Bays and estuaries	87,791 square miles	56,141 square miles	63.9	11,516 square miles	0 square miles	44,625 square miles
Coastal shoreline	58,618 miles	4,627 miles	7.9	1,298 miles	0 miles	3,329 miles
Ocean and near coastal waters	54,120 square miles	6,944 square miles	12.8	726 square miles	0 square miles	6,218 square miles
Wetlands	107,700,000 acres	1,242,252 acres	1.2	569,328 acres	0 acres	672,924 Acres
Great Lakes shoreline	5,202 miles	4,460 miles	85.7	106 miles	0 miles	4,354 miles
Great Lakes open waters	196,343 square miles	39,231 square miles	20.0	1 square mile	0 square miles	39,230 square miles

Waters and wetlands classified by states as “good” meets all their designated uses. Waters classified as “threatened” currently support all of their designated uses, but if pollution control measures are not taken one or more of those uses may become impaired in the future. A water or wetland is classified by the state as “impaired” if any one of its designated uses is not met. The definitions of “good,” “threatened,” and “impaired” are applied by states to describe the quality of their waters (the above definitions were found in the metadata in U.S. EPA (2015)). Designated uses include the “protection and propagation of fish, shellfish and wildlife,” “recreation in and on the water,” the use of waters for “public water supplies, propagation of fish, shellfish, wildlife, recreation in and on the water,” and “agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation.” (40 CFR 130.3). These designated uses are assessed by states in a variety of ways, by examining various physical, chemical and biological characteristics, so it is not possible to use the categories of “good,” “threatened,” and “impaired” to infer the level of ecological functions and services these waters perform.

According to the latest U.S. EPA national summary data, 52.9 percent of assessed rivers and streams, 70.9 percent of assessed lakes, reservoirs, and ponds, 79.5

percent of assessed bays and estuaries, 71.9 percent of assessed coastal shoreline, 89.5 percent of assessed ocean and near coastal waters, 54.2 percent of assessed wetlands, 97.6 percent of assessed Great Lakes shoreline, and 100 percent of Great Lakes open water are impaired.

Twenty-eight causes of impairment were identified for bays and estuaries. The top 10 causes of impairment for these waters are: polychlorinated biphenyls, nutrients, mercury, turbidity, dioxins, toxic organics, metals (other than mercury), pesticides, pathogens, and organic enrichment/oxygen depletion. For bays and estuaries, the top 10 sources of impairment are: legacy/historic pollutants, urban-related runoff/stormwater, unknown sources, atmospheric deposition, municipal discharges/sewage, unspecified non-point sources, other sources, natural/wildlife, agriculture, and industrial.

Coastal shorelines were impaired by 16 identified causes, the top 10 of which are: mercury, pathogens, turbidity, organic enrichment/oxygen depletion, pH/acidity/caustic conditions, nutrients, oil and grease, temperature, cause unknown – impaired biota, and algal growth. The top 10 sources of impairment of coastal shorelines are municipal discharges/sewage, urban-related runoff/stormwater, unknown sources, recreational boating and marinas, hydromodification, industrial, unspecified non-point sources, agriculture, legacy/historic pollutants, and land application/waste sites/tanks.

Ocean and near coastal waters were impaired by 16 identified causes, the top 10 of which are: mercury, organic enrichment/oxygen depletion, pathogens, metals (other than mercury), pesticides, turbidity, nuisance exotic species, total toxics, pH/acidity/caustic conditions, and polychlorinated biphenyls. The top 10 sources of impairment of ocean and near coastal waters are: atmospheric deposition, unknown sources, unspecified non-point sources, other sources, recreation and tourism (non-boating), recreational boating and marinas, urban-related runoff/stormwater, hydromodification, municipal discharges/sewage, and construction.

Water quality standards are established by states, with review and approval by the U.S. EPA (see Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act and the implementing regulations at 40 CFR part 131). Under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act States review proposed discharges to determine compliance with applicable water quality standards.

Most causes and sources of impairment identified by states in the water quality summary discussed above are not due to activities regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Inputs of sediments into aquatic ecosystems can result from erosion occurring within a watershed (Beechie et al. 2013, Gosselink and Lee 1989). As water moves through a watershed it carries sediments and pollutants to streams (e.g., Allan 2004, Dudgeon et al. 2005, Paul and Meyer 2001) and wetlands (e.g., Zedler and Kercher 2005, Wright et al. 2006). Non-point sources of pollution (i.e., pollutants carried in

runoff from farms, roads, and urban areas) are largely uncontrolled (Brown and Froemke 2012) because the Clean Water Act only requires permits for point sources discharges of pollutants (i.e., discharges of dredged or fill material regulated under section 404 and point source discharges of other pollutants regulated under section 402). Estuaries across the world have been substantially degraded by human activities (NRC 2010). Habitat alterations as a cause or source of impairment may be the result of activities regulated under section 404 and section 10 because they involve discharges of dredged or fill material or structures or work in navigable waters, but habitat alterations may also occur as a result of activities not regulated under those two statutes, such as the removal of vegetation from upland riparian areas. Hydrologic modifications may or may not be regulated under section 404 or section 10.

The indirect effects of changes in upland land use (which are highly likely not to be subject to federal control and responsibility, at least in terms of the Corps Regulatory Program), including the construction and expansion of upland developments, have substantial adverse effects on the quality (i.e. the ability to perform hydrologic, biogeochemical, and habitat functions) of jurisdictional waters and wetlands because those upland activities alter watershed-scale processes. Those watershed-scale processes include water movement and storage, erosion and sediment transport, and the transport of nutrients and other pollutants.

Habitat alterations as a cause or source of impairment may be the result of activities regulated under section 404 and section 10 because they involve discharges of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional waters or structures or work in navigable waters, but habitat alterations may also occur as a result of activities not regulated under those two statutes, such as the removal of vegetation from upland riparian areas. Hydrologic modifications may or may not be regulated under section 404 or section 10, depending on whether those hydrologic modifications are the result of discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act or structures or work in navigable waters of the United States regulated under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. When states, tribes, or the U.S. EPA establish total daily maximum loads (TMDLs) for pollutants and other impairments for specific waters, there may be variations in how these TMDLs are defined (see 40 CFR part 130).

As discussed below, many anthropogenic activities and natural processes affect the ability of jurisdictional waters and wetlands to perform ecological functions. Stream and river functions are affected by activities occurring in their watersheds, including the indirect effects of land uses changes (Beechie et al. 2013, Allan 2004, Paul and Meyer 2001). Booth et al. (2004) found riparian land use in residential areas also strongly affects stream condition because many landowners clear vegetation up to the edge of the stream bank. The removal of vegetation from upland riparian areas and other activities in those non-jurisdictional areas do not require DA authorization. Wetland functions are also affected by indirect effects of land use activities in the land area that drains to the wetland (Zedler and Kercher 2005, Wright et al. 2006).

Human activities within a watershed or catchment that have direct or indirect adverse effects on rivers, streams, wetlands, and other aquatic ecosystems are not limited to discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States or structures or work in a navigable waters. Human activities in uplands have substantial indirect effects on the structure and function of aquatic ecosystems, including streams and wetlands, and their ability to sustain populations of listed species. It is extremely difficult to distinguish between degradation of water quality caused by upland activities and degradation of water quality caused by the filling or alteration of wetlands (Gosselink and Lee 1989).

4.3 Aquatic Resource Functions and Services

Functions are the physical, chemical, and biological processes that occur in ecosystems (33 CFR 332.2). Wetland functions occur through interactions of their physical, chemical, and biological features (Smith et al. 1995). Wetland functions depend on a number of factors, such as the movement of water through the wetland, landscape position, surrounding land uses, vegetation density within the wetland, geology, soils, water source, and wetland size (NRC 1995). In its evaluation of wetland compensatory mitigation in the Clean Water Act Section 404 permit program, the National Research Council (2001) recognized five general categories of wetland functions:

- Hydrologic functions
- Water quality improvement
- Vegetation support
- Habitat support for animals
- Soil functions

Hydrologic functions include short- and long-term water storage and the maintenance of wetland hydrology (NRC 1995). Water quality improvement functions encompass the transformation or cycling of nutrients, the retention, transformation, or removal of pollutants, and the retention of sediments (NRC 1995). Vegetation support functions include the maintenance of plant communities, which support various species of animals as well as economically important plants. Wetland soils support diverse communities of bacteria and fungi which are critical for biogeochemical processes, including nutrient cycling and pollutant removal and transformation (NRC 2001). Wetland soils also provide rooting media for plants, as well as nutrients and water for those plants. These various functions generally interact with each other, to influence overall wetland functioning, or ecological integrity (Smith et al. 1995; Fennessy et al. 2007). As discussed earlier in this report, the Corps regulations at 33 CFR 320.4(b) list wetland functions that are important for the public interest review during evaluations of applications for DA permits, and for the issuance of general permits.

Not all wetlands perform the same functions, nor do they provide functions to the same degree (Smith et al. 1995). Therefore, it is necessary to account for individual

and regional variation when evaluating wetlands and the functions and services they provide. The types and levels of functions performed by a wetland are dependent on its hydrologic regime, the plant species inhabiting the wetland, soil type, and the surrounding landscape, including the degree of human disturbance of the landscape (Smith et al. 1995).

Ecosystem services are the benefits that humans derive from ecosystem functions (33 CFR 332.2). The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005a) describes four categories of ecosystem services: provisioning services, regulating services, cultural services, and supporting services. For wetlands and open waters, provisioning services include the production of food (e.g., fish, shellfish, game, seaweeds), fresh water storage, food and fiber production, production of chemicals that can be used for medicine and other purposes, and supporting genetic diversity for resistance to disease. Regulating services relating to open waters and wetlands consist of climate regulation, control of oceanographic and hydrologic flows, water quality through the removal, retention, and recovery of nutrients and pollutants, erosion control, mitigating natural hazards such as floods, and providing habitat for organisms. Cultural services that come from open waters include spiritual and religious values, recreational opportunities, aesthetics, and education.

Aquatic ecosystems in the current affected environment provide a wide variety of ecological functions and services to differing degrees (MEA 2005a) to human communities. Degraded ecosystems can provide ecological functions and services that continue to provide some conservation value (Weins and Hobbs 2015).

Examples of services provided by wetland functions include flood damage reduction, maintenance of populations of economically important fish and wildlife species, maintenance of water quality (NRC 1995, MEA 2005a) and the production of populations of wetland plant species that are economically important commodities, such as timber, fiber, and fuel (MEA 2005a). Wetlands can also provide important climate regulation and storm protection services (MEA 2005a).

Marine ecosystems provide a number of ecosystem services, including fish production; materials cycling (e.g., nitrogen, carbon, oxygen, phosphorous, and sulfur); transformation, detoxification, and sequestration of pollutants and wastes produced by humans; support of ocean-based recreation, tourism, and retirement industries; and coastal land development and valuation, including aesthetics related to living near the ocean (Peterson and Lubchenco 1997).

Seagrasses provide ecological services such as organic carbon production, detrital export, nutrient cycling, sediment stabilization, increased biodiversity, habitat for a variety of aquatic organisms (including fish species of recreational and commercial importance), and energy exchanges with other aquatic habitats (Orth et al. 2006).

Costanza et al. (2014) estimated the value of ecosystem services, by general categories of ecosystem type. Their estimates, based on data analysis conducted in

2011 and using the 2007 value of the U.S. dollar, are provided in Table 4.5. The ecosystem categories providing the highest values of ecosystem services by acre per year were coral reefs (\$142,661 per acre per year), followed by tidal marshes and mangrove wetlands (\$78,506 per acre per year). Forested and floodplain wetlands had a value of \$10,401 per acre per year.

Table 4.5 – Estimates of the value of ecosystem services, by ecosystem category (Costanza et al. 2014)

Ecosystem category	2007\$ per acre per year
Marine	554
open ocean	24
coastal	3,622
• estuaries	11,711
• seagrass/algae beds	11,711
• coral reefs	142,661
• coastal shelf	900
Terrestrial	1,985
forest	1,539
• tropical	2,180
• temperate/boreal	1,270
grass/rangelands	1,687
wetlands	56,770
• tidal marsh/mangroves	78,506
• swamps/floodplains	10,401
lakes/rivers	5,067
desert	-
tundra	-
ice/rock	-
cropland	2,255
urban	2,698

This NWP authorizes activities in navigable waters of the United States, including federal waters on the outer continental shelf. The waters in which this NWP would normally be used are the estuarine and marine systems of the Cowardin classification system.

When natural ecosystems are converted to human-dominated ecosystems, there are tradeoffs between the losses in ecosystem services provided by natural ecosystems and the gains in goods and services provided by land use changes, resource extraction, harvesting, and other activities (MEA 2005c). For thousands of years, human communities have altered landscapes and ecosystems to serve their needs, such as food, safety, and commerce, and made trade-offs by increasing certain ecosystem functions and services while reducing other ecosystem functions and services (Karieva et al. 2007).

Seaweed mariculture activities can provide a number of ecological functions and services. Multi-species mariculture activities may be authorized through this and other NWPs for finfish and shellfish cultivation in addition to seaweed cultivation.

These activities may have beneficial or adverse effects on the natural environment and projects of this type are not common in the U.S., meaning these effects are not well understood. These activities can have positive effects on supporting, regulating and provisioning services, and negative effects on cultural services (Hasselström et al. 2018). For these activities, trade-offs in ecosystem services should be evaluated in a local context (Hasselström et al. 2018). Seaweed mariculture activities can provide sources of protein and other nutrients to human populations (Kim et al. 2017). Seaweed mariculture activities can also produce other compounds that are used by society (Kim et al. 2017). Seaweed mariculture activities can provide ecosystem services beyond provisioning services (food production) (Alleway et al. 2019), in coastal waters that have been altered by human activities. Spatial planning for seaweed mariculture activities can help identify locations where these cultivation activities can provide other ecosystem services (Alleway et al. 2019) and minimize potential environmental and social impacts (Gentry et al. 2016). Benefits from mariculture activities, whether focused on seaweed or multi-species, are short-term because the species cultivated are meant to be harvested. Depending on the mariculture activity, harvesting techniques can result in adverse effects to the environment such as disturbance of benthic habitat.

4.4 Human Activities and Natural Factors that Affect the Quantity and Quality of Aquatic Ecosystems in the United States

The affected environment is the current environmental setting against which the environmental effects of the proposed action is evaluated, to determine whether the issuance of the NWP will have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. The affected environment is also used as a basis for comparison to determine whether activities authorized by the NWP will result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects when added to the current environmental setting.

For thousands of years, humans have caused substantial impacts on ecosystems and the ecological functions and services they provide (Ellis et al. 2010, Evans and Davis 2018). Around the beginning of the 19th century, the degree of impacts of human activities on the Earth's ecosystems began to exceed the degree of impacts to ecosystems caused by natural disturbances and variability (Steffen et al. 2007). All of the Earth's ecosystems have been affected either directly or indirectly by human activities (Vitousek et al. 1997). Over 75 percent of the ice-free land on Earth has been altered by human occupation and use (Ellis and Ramankutty 2008). Approximately 33 percent of the Earth's ice-free land consists of lands heavily used by people: urban areas, villages, lands used to produce crops, and occupied rangelands (Ellis and Ramankutty 2008). For marine ecosystems, Halpern et al. (2008) determined that there are no marine waters that are unaffected by human activities, and that 41 percent of the area of ocean waters are affected by multiple anthropogenic stressors (e.g., land use activities that generate pollution that go to coastal waters, marine habitat destruction or modification, and the extraction of

resources). The marine waters most highly impacted by human activities are continental shelf and slope areas, which are affected by both land-based and ocean-based human activities (Halpern et al. 2008). Human population density is a good indicator of the relative effect that people have had on local ecosystems, with lower population densities causing smaller impacts to ecosystems and higher population densities having larger impacts on ecosystems (Ellis and Ramankutty 2008). Human activities such as urbanization, agriculture, and forestry alter ecosystem structure and function by changing their interactions with other ecosystems, their biogeochemical cycles, and their species composition (Vitousek et al. 1997). Changes in land use reduce the ability of ecosystems to produce ecosystem services, such as food production, reducing infectious diseases, and regulating climate and air quality (Foley et al. 2005).

Ecosystems are not separate from human communities, and they are interdependent and comprise a single social-ecological system (Folke et al. 2011). Social-ecological systems are altered by human activities, as well as natural perturbations and changing environmental conditions, but they possess resilience and adaptive capacities that allow them to continue to provide ecological functions and services when properly managed (Chapin et al. 2010). Social-ecological systems exist at a number of scales, ranging from local to regional to global (Folke et al. 2010). Despite the prevalence of human activities altering landscapes and seascapes and the ecosystems within those landscapes and seascapes over long periods of time, many of those ecosystems continue to provide ecological functions and services to varying degrees (Clewell and Aronson 2013). Disturbances to ecosystems, landscapes, and seascapes may result in those systems recovering to their original state through biotic and abiotic characteristics and processes that provide resilience, or those systems may be transformed to a different ecological state (i.e., an alternative stable state) (van Andel and Aronson 2012). From the perspective of social-ecological systems, resilience is defined by Folke et al. (2010) as the capacity of a social-ecological system to withstand disturbance and undergo changes, while retaining its ability to exhibit similar structure, functions, and interactions. If the ecosystem, landscape, or seascape changes to an alternative stable state, the alternative stable state may be considered an improvement or degradation, depending on the perspective of the person evaluating the change (Backstrom et al. 2018, van Andel and Aronson 2012). This NWP will be used to authorize certain activities that require DA authorization in these social-ecological systems, and the potential environmental consequences of the reissuance of this NWP is evaluated under the current environmental setting and the potential impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands that may occur during the 5-year period this NWP is anticipated to be in effect. The environmental consequences of the reissuance of this NWP is also considered for the various public interest review factors in section 6.0 of this document, which include social and ecological components.

Recent changes in climate have had substantial impacts on natural ecosystems and human communities (IPCC 2014). Climate change, both natural and anthropogenic,

is a major driving force for changes in ecosystem structure, function, and dynamics (Millar and Brubaker 2006). However, there are other significant drivers of change to aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. In addition to climate change, aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems are also adversely affected by land use and land cover changes, natural resource extraction (including water withdrawals), pollution, species introductions, and removals of species (NAS and RS 2019, Staudt et al. 2013, Bodkin 2012, MEA 2005a) and changes in nutrient cycling (Julius et al. 2013). During the past century, changes to ecosystems have been driven primarily by changes in biological factors, such as land use/land cover changes and the spread of non-native species, but in the future changes in abiotic processes, such as climate change and nitrogen deposition, may become predominant drivers of ecosystem change (Radeloff et al. 2015). The current contribution of climate change to changes in ecosystems is small compared to other anthropogenic causes of change to ecosystems (Radeloff et al. 2015, Williams et al. 2019) that are identified above, especially land use and land cover changes.

Table 4.6 – Human activities and natural factors that cause changes in aquatic ecosystems and the functions and services they perform

Resource type(s)	Human activities and natural factors that drive ecosystem change	Reference(s)
wetlands and waters (generally)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land use/land cover changes • alien species introductions • species overexploitation • pollution • eutrophication • resource extraction (e.g., water withdrawals) • climate change • natural disturbances 	MEA (2005a)

Resource type(s)	Human activities and natural factors that drive ecosystem change	Reference(s)
wetlands, including estuaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wetland conversion through drainage, dredging, and filling • hydrologic modifications that change wetland hydrology and hydrodynamics • pollutants (point source and non-point source), including nutrients and contaminants • waterfowl and wildlife management activities • agriculture and aquaculture activities • flood control and stormwater protection (e.g., severing hydrologic connections between rivers and floodplain wetlands) • silvicultural activities • agricultural activities • urban development • mining activities • water withdrawals, aquifer depletion • river management (e.g., channelization, navigation improvements, dams, locks, weirs) • altered sediment transport • introductions of non-native species • land subsidence, erosion 	<p>Mitsch and Gosselink (2015) Mitsch and Hernandez (2013) Wright et al. (2006) Zedler and Kercher (2005) Brinson and Malvárez (2002)</p>
seagrass beds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dredging • coastal development activities • degradation of water quality • sediment and nutrient runoff from adjacent lands • physical disturbances • natural processes, such as herbivore grazing, physical disturbances caused by waves and tidal currents • invasive species • diseases • commercial fishing activities • aquaculture • algal blooms • low light availability • nutrient limitations • global climate change 	<p>Borum et al. (2013) Waycott et al. (2009) Orth et al. (2006)</p>

coral reefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overexploitation/overfishing • destructive fishing practices • nutrients, sediments, pesticides, and other pollutants (point source and non-point source) • nutrient loading • changes in storm frequency and intensity • increasing ocean surface temperatures • ocean acidification • coastal land uses, including development and agriculture • coral mining • sea level rise • invasive species • diseases • bleaching • global climate change 	Sheppard (2014) MEA (2005a) Hughes et al. (2003)
coastal areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development activities, including the construction of residences, commercial buildings, industrial facilities, resorts, and port developments • agricultural and forestry activities • point source and non-point source pollution (nutrients, organic matter, other pollutants) • aquaculture • fishing activities • overharvesting of species • intentional and unintentional introductions of non-native species • dredging • reclamation • shore protection and other structures • habitat modifications • changes to hydrology and hydrodynamics • global climate change • shoreline erosion • pathogens and toxins • debris and litter 	Robb (2014) Day et al. (2013) Lotze et al. (2006) MEA (2005b) NRC (1994)
oceans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pollution (point and non-point source) • fishing activities • changes in sea temperatures • ultraviolet light • ocean acidification • species invasions • commercial activities • other human activities • benthic structures • offshore energy infrastructure (e.g., wind farms, pipelines) 	Halpern et al. (2015) Halpern et al. (2008)

Aquatic resources and the functions and services they provide are directly and indirectly affected by changes in land use and land cover, alien species introductions, overexploitation of species, pollution, eutrophication due to excess

nutrients, resource extraction including water withdrawals, climate change, and various natural disturbances (MEA 2005a). Cumulative effects to wetlands, streams, and other aquatic resources that form the current environmental setting are the result of landscape-level processes (Gosselink and Lee 1989) and seascape-level processes. As discussed in more detail below, cumulative or aggregate effects to aquatic resources are caused by a variety of activities (including activities that occur entirely in uplands) that take place within a landscape or seascape unit, such as the watershed for a river or stream (e.g., Allan 2004, Paul and Meyer 2001, Leopold 1968) the contributing drainage area for a wetland (e.g., Wright et al. 2006, Brinson and Malvárez 2002, Zedler and Kercher 2005), .

There is little national-level information on the current ecological state of the Nation's wetlands, streams, and other aquatic resources, or the general degree to which they perform various ecological functions, although reviews have acknowledged that most of these aquatic resources are degraded to some degree (Zedler and Kercher 2005, Allan 2004) or impaired (U.S. EPA 2015) because of various activities, disturbances, and other stressors. Therefore, the analysis in this environmental assessment is a qualitative analysis.

There is a wide variety of causes and sources of impairment of the Nation's rivers, streams, wetlands, lakes, estuarine waters, and marine waters (U.S. EPA 2015), which also contribute to cumulative effects to these aquatic resources. Many of those causes of impairment are point and non-point sources of pollutants that are not regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Two common causes of impairment for rivers and streams, habitat alterations and flow alterations, may be due in part to activities regulated by the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Habitat and flow alterations may also be the caused by activities that do not involve discharges of dredged or fill material or structures or work in navigable waters. For wetlands, impairment due to habitat alterations, flow alterations, and hydrology modifications may involve activities regulated under section 404, but these causes of impairment may also be due to unregulated activities, such as changes in upland land use that affects the movement of water through a watershed or contributing drainage area or the removal of vegetation.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA 2005a) broadly defines wetlands as inland wetlands (e.g., swamps, marshes, lakes, rivers, peatlands, and underground water habitats), coastal and near-shore marine wetlands (e.g., coral reefs, mangroves, seagrass beds, and estuaries), and human-made wetlands (e.g., rice fields, dams, reservoirs, and fish ponds). According to the MEA (2005a), the principal drivers of direct change to estuarine and marine wetlands include the conversion of saltwater marshes, mangroves, seagrass meadows, and coral reefs to other land uses, diversions of freshwater flows, increased inputs of nitrogen, overharvesting various species, water temperature changes, and species introductions. These changes are indirectly driven by increases in human

populations in coastal areas (MEA 2005a). Robb (2014) identified a number of threats to estuaries and estuarine habitats such as salt marshes, seagrass beds, and sand flats. Those threats include land-based activities in surrounding watersheds, such as development activities, agricultural activities, forestry activities, pollution, freshwater diversions, shoreline stabilization, waterway impairments, and inputs of debris and litter. With respect to activities occurring directly in coastal waters, Robb (2014) identified the following threats: shoreline development, the construction and operation of port facilities, dredging, marine pollution, aquaculture activities, resource extraction activities, species introductions, and recreational activities. Changing climate conditions also pose threats to estuaries through sea level rise, changing water temperatures, ocean acidification, and changing precipitation patterns (Robb 2014).

Marine and coastal waters are affected by human activities in the ocean, coastal areas, and watersheds that drain to those marine and coastal waters (Korpinen and Andersen 2016). In marine and coastal environments, human activities and other disturbances that affect resources in those waters can come from a variety of sources, including water-based activities (e.g., transportation, fishing, mariculture, power generation, and tourism) and land-based activities (e.g., urban and suburban development, agriculture, non-point source pollution, forestry activities, power generation, and mining activities) (Clark Murray et al. 2014).

Waycott et al. (2009) estimated that the areal extent of seagrass beds across the world has declined by nearly 30 percent since the late 19th century. They identified two main categories of causes for that decline: direct impacts from dredging and coastal development activities, and indirect impacts from degradation of water quality. Submersed aquatic vegetation is affected by a wide variety of human activities such as dredging in seagrass meadows, anchoring vessels in seagrass beds, coastal development activities, increased sediment inputs from a variety of sources including land development activities, habitat conversions resulting from mariculture activities, increased nutrient inputs to coastal waters, and climate change (MEA 2005a). According to Orth et al. (2006), seagrasses are threatened by numerous stressors, such as sediment and nutrient runoff from adjacent lands, physical disturbances, overgrazing, invasive species, diseases, commercial fishing activities, aquaculture, algal blooms, and global climate change. Human activities that contribute to cumulative effects to submerged aquatic vegetation include coastal development, hard shore stabilization structures, land uses changes in surrounding watersheds that increase inputs of sediments, nutrients, and pollutants to waters inhabited (or could be inhabited) by seagrasses, discharges of pollutants directly into waters, aquaculture activities, and boating activities (Orth et al. 2017, Orth et al. 2006). Orth et al. (2017, 2006) did not quantify how frequently each of these stressors pose threats to seagrasses or the relative contributions of each of the identified human activities that affect seagrasses. Submersed aquatic vegetation may be affected by natural processes, such as herbivore grazing, physical disturbances caused by waves and tidal currents, and other stressors such as low light availability, higher temperatures, or nutrient limitations (Borum et al.

2013). Boating activities (e.g., mooring, use of propellers) and fish and shellfish harvesting activities can also contribute to cumulative impacts to submersed aquatic vegetation beds (Fonseca et al. 1998). The recovery of submersed aquatic vegetation from anthropogenic and natural disturbances can vary by species, and is dependent in part on the reproductive mechanisms of those species (Borum et al. 2013, Fonseca et al. 1998). At the meadow or landscape scale, seagrass beds can fully recover after disturbance within 5 years, but recovery can take longer if there are persistent environmental changes persist or seagrass seeds or other propagules are not available to reestablish seagrasses in the affected area (O'Brien et al. 2018).

A variety of human activities have caused, and are continuing to cause declines in corals and coral reefs. Coral reefs are adversely affected by pollution, including sedimentation, excess nutrients, oil discharges, pesticides, and sewage (Sheppard 2014; MEA 2005a; Hughes et al. 2003). Shoreline development activities, development activities in watersheds draining to coastal waters, and agriculture activities in coastal watersheds also contribute to declines in corals and coral reefs (Sheppard 2014; MEA 2005a; Hughes et al. 2003). The pollution may be in runoff from nearby lands or discharged directly into waters inhabited by corals. Corals and coral reefs are also harmed by overexploitation, including overfishing, as well as destructive fishing practices (MEA 2005a) and anchors used by boats (Sheppard 2014). Climate change and associated increases in storm frequency and intensity, diseases, water temperatures, and coral bleaching also contribute to declines in corals and coral reefs (Sheppard 2014; MEA 2005a; Hughes et al. 2003). Invasive species have also affected corals and coral reefs (Sheppard 2014).

For aquatic ecosystems, climate change affects water quality, biogeochemical cycling, and water storage (Julius et al. 2013). Climate change will also affect the abundance and distribution of wetlands across the United States, as well as the functions they provide (Mitsch and Gosselink 2015). Climate change results in increases in water temperatures, more waterbodies with anoxic conditions, degradation of water quality, and increases in flood and drought frequencies (Julius et al. 2013). The increasing carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere also changes the pH of the oceans, resulting in ocean acidification (RS and NAS 2014), which adversely affects corals and some other marine organisms.

In the United States, approximately 39 percent of its population lives in counties that are next to coastal waters, the territorial seas, or the Great Lakes (NOAA 2013). Those counties comprise less than 10 percent of the land area of the United States (NOAA 2013). Humans have been altering estuarine waters and coastal areas for millennia, but those changes have rapidly accelerated over the past 150 to 300 years (Lotze et al. 2006). Coastal waters are also affected by a wide variety of activities. Day et al. (2013) identified the following general categories of human activities that impact estuaries: physical alterations (e.g., habitat modifications and changes in hydrology and hydrodynamics), increases in inputs of nutrients and organic matter (enrichment), releases of toxins, and changes in biological

communities as a result of harvesting activities and intentional and unintentional introductions of new species. The major drivers of changes to coastal areas are: development activities that alter coastal forests, wetlands, and coral reef habitats for aquaculture and the construction of urban areas, industrial facilities, and resort and port developments (MEA 2005b). Dredging, reclamation, shore protection and other structures (e.g., causeways and bridges), and some types of fishing activities also cause substantial changes to coastal areas (MEA 2005b). Nitrogen pollution to coastal zones change coral reef communities (MEA 2005b). Adverse effects to coastal waters are caused by habitat modifications, point source pollution, non-point source pollution, changes to hydrology and hydrodynamics, exploitation of coastal resources, introduction of non-native species, global climate change, shoreline erosion, and pathogens and toxins (NRC 1994). Over the course of history, in estuarine waters human activities caused declines of greater than 90 percent of important species, losses of more than 65 percent of seagrasses and wetland habitat, substantially degraded water quality, and facilitated introductions of new species (Lotze et al. 2006).

Substantial alterations of coastal hydrology and hydrodynamics are caused by land use changes in watersheds draining to coastal waters, the channelization or damming of streams and rivers, water consumption, and water diversions (NRC 1994). Approximately 52 percent of the population of the United States lives in coastal watersheds (NOAA 2013). Eutrophication of coastal waters is caused by nutrients contributed by waste treatment systems, non-point sources, and the atmosphere, and may cause hypoxia or anoxia in coastal waters (NRC 1994). Changes in water movement through watersheds may also alter sediment delivery to coastal areas, which affects the sustainability of wetlands and intertidal habitats and the functions they provide (NRC 1994). Most inland waters in the United States drain to coastal areas, and therefore activities that occur in inland watersheds affect coastal waters (NRC 1994). Inland land uses, such as agriculture, urban development, and forestry, adversely affect coastal waters by diverting fresh water from estuaries and by acting as sources of nutrients and pollutants to coastal waters (MEA 2005b).

Coastal wetlands have been substantially altered by urban development and changes to the watersheds that drain to those wetlands (Mitsch and Hernandez 2013). Coastal habitat modifications are the result of dredging or filling coastal waters, inputs of sediment via non-point sources, changes in water quality, or alteration of coastal hydrodynamics (NRC 1994). Coastal development activities, including those that occur in uplands, affect marine and estuarine habitats (MEA 2005a). The introduction of non-native species may change the functions and structure of coastal wetlands and other habitats (MEA 2005a). Fishing activities may also modify coastal habitats by changing habitat structure and the biological communities that inhabit those areas (NRC 1994).

In order to effectively understand and manage ecosystems, including aquatic ecosystems, it is necessary to take into account how people and societies have

reshaped aquatic and terrestrial resources over time (Ellis 2015), through the effects of human activities on those ecosystems. This includes permitting programs that regulate activities in aquatic resources and other types of natural resources. The current state of an ecosystem (e.g., a wetland or an estuary) can range from “near natural” (i.e., minimally disturbed) to semi-natural to production systems such as agricultural lands to overexploited (i.e., severely impaired) (van Andel and Aronson 2012). Degradation occurs when an ecosystem is subjected to a prolonged disturbance (Clewell and Aronson 2013), and the degree of degradation can be dependent, in part, on the severity of disturbance. Disturbances can be caused by human activities or by natural events, such as changes to ecosystems caused by ecosystem engineers (e.g., beavers) and other organisms, storms, fires, or earthquakes. Two important factors that affect how aquatic ecosystems and other ecosystems respond to disturbances are resistance and resilience.

For ecosystems, stability is the ability of an ecosystem to return its starting state after one or more disturbances cause a significant change in environmental conditions (van Andel et al. 2012). Resistance is the ability of an ecosystem to exhibit little or no change in structure or function when exposed to a disturbance (van Andel et al. 2012). Resilience is the ability of an ecosystem to regain its structural and functional characteristics in a relatively short amount of time after it has been exposed to a disturbance (van Andel et al. 2012). Human activities can change the resilience of ecosystems (Gunderson 2000). In some situations, resilience can be a positive attribute (e.g., the ability to withstand disturbances), and in other situations, resilience can be a negative attribute (e.g., when it is not possible to restore ecosystem because it has changed to the degree where it is resistant to being restored) (Walker et al. 2004). The concept of ecological resilience presumes the existence of multiple stable states, and the ability of ecosystems to tolerate some degree of disturbance before transitioning to an alternative (different) stable state (Gunderson 2000). A regime shift (i.e., a change from one stable state to an alternative stable state) can occur when human activities reduce the resilience of an ecosystem, or functional groups of species within that ecosystem, or when there are changes in the magnitude, frequency, and duration of disturbances (Folke et al. 2004). Folke et al. (2004) and Gunderson (2000) provide examples of aquatic ecosystems that can exist in multiple stable states.

An example of a regime change in an estuary is a shift from an estuary with clear waters and benthic communities dominated by seagrasses, to an estuary with turbid waters dominated by phytoplankton that has insufficient light for seagrasses to grow and persist (Folke et al. 2004). Another example of a regime shift is where an increase in nutrients to a wetland (likely from many sources in the area draining to that wetland) causes a wetland’s plant community from a diverse plant community dependent on low nutrient levels to a monotypic plant community dominated by an invasive species that can persist under the higher nutrient levels (Gunderson 2000).

Determining whether an ecosystem altered by human activities is degraded or in an alternative stable state depends on the perspective of the person making that

judgment (Hobbs 2016). That judgment is dependent in part on the ecological functions and services currently being provided by the alternative stable state and the value local stakeholders place on those ecosystem functions and services. In other words, different people may have different views on the current ecological state of a particular ecosystem (Hobbs 2016, Walker et al. 2004): some people may think it is degraded and other people may think it continues to provide important ecological functions and services. It is also important to understand that degradation can be considered both a state, and a process that falls along a continuum, ranging from minimally degraded to severely degraded, since all ecosystems have been directly or indirectly altered by human activities to some degree (FAO 2011). Degraded ecosystems can continue to provide important ecological functions and services, although they may be different from what they provided historically. In summary, the affected environment or current environmental setting consists of a variety of aquatic and terrestrial resources that have been subjected to varying degrees of disturbance by human activities, and provide different degrees of aquatic resource functions and services.

5.0 Environmental Consequences

5.1 General Evaluation Criteria

This document contains a general assessment of the reasonably foreseeable effects of the individual activities authorized by this NWP and the anticipated cumulative effects of the activities authorized by this NWP during the 5-year period it is anticipated to be in effect. In the assessment of these individual and cumulative effects, the terms and limits of the NWP, pre-construction notification requirements, and the standard NWP general conditions are considered. The NWP general conditions include mitigation measures that reduce individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. The supplemental documentation provided by division engineers will address how regional conditions affect the individual and cumulative effects of the NWP.

The environmental effects of proposed activities are evaluated by assessing the direct and indirect effects that those activities have on the current environmental setting (Canter 1996). The current environmental setting is the product of the cumulative or aggregated effects of human activities that have persisted over time, as well as the natural processes that have influenced, and continue to influence, the structure, functions, and dynamics of ecosystems. The current environmental setting includes the present effects of past activities authorized by previously issued versions of this NWP and other NWPs. The current environmental setting can vary substantially in different areas of the country and in different waterbodies. The current environmental setting is dependent in part on the degree to which past and present human activities have altered aquatic and terrestrial resources in a particular geographic area over time. For a particular site in which an NWP may

take place, the current environmental setting can range from highly developed/overexploited (e.g., urban areas, where human impacts to ecosystems are highest) to production systems (e.g., agricultural lands) to seminatural (e.g., parks) to near natural (e.g., wilderness areas, where human impacts to ecosystems are lowest) (van Andel and Aronson 2012). Human impacts on semi-natural ecosystems are lower than human impacts to production ecosystems (van Andel and Aronson 2012). Since humans have altered aquatic and terrestrial environments in numerous, substantial ways for thousands of years (e.g., Evans and Davis 2018, Ellis 2015), the current environmental setting takes into account how human activities and changing biotic and abiotic conditions have modified existing aquatic and terrestrial resources.

The terms “cumulative effects” and “cumulative impacts” have been defined in various ways. For example, the National Research Council (NRC) (1986) defined “cumulative effects” as the on-going degradation of ecological systems caused by repeated perturbations or disturbances. MacDonald (2000) defines “cumulative effects” as the result of the combined effects of multiple activities that occur in a particular area that persist over time. Cumulative effects are caused by the interaction of multiple activities in a landscape unit, such as a watershed or ecoregion (Gosselink and Lee 1989), or a seascape. Cumulative effects can accrue in a number of ways. Cumulative effects can occur when there are repetitive disturbances at a single site over time, and the resource is not able to fully recover between each disturbance. Cumulative effects can also occur as a result of multiple activities occurring in a geographic area over time.

Consistent with the definitions cited above, the cumulative impacts of this NWP are the product of how many times this NWP is used to authorize structures in navigable waters of the United States, including federal waters on the outer continental shelf, across the country during the 5-year period this NWP is anticipated to be in effect. In section 5.2 of this document, the Corps estimates the number of times this NWP will be used during the 5-year period it is expected to be in effect, as well as estimates of the acreage of permanent and temporary impacts, and the acreage of compensatory mitigation required by district engineers to offset losses of jurisdictional waters. The individual and cumulative impacts of activities authorized by this NWP are evaluated against the current environmental setting. This approach is consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality’s definition of “effects or impacts” at 40 CFR 1508.1(g): “Effects or impacts means changes to the human environment from the proposed action or alternatives that are reasonably foreseeable and have a reasonably close causal relationship to the proposed action or alternatives.” The estimated use of this NWP, as well as the estimated authorized impacts and required compensatory mitigation, over the next 5 years are reasonably foreseeable and have a reasonably close causal relationship to the issuance of this NWP.

The following evaluation comprises the NEPA analysis and the public interest review specified in 33 CFR 320.4(a)(1) and (2).

The issuance of an NWP is based on a general assessment of the effects on public interest and environmental factors that are likely to occur as a result of using this NWP to authorize activities in waters of the United States. As such, this assessment must be speculative or predictive in general terms. Since NWPs authorize activities across the nation, projects eligible for NWP authorization may be constructed in a wide variety of environmental settings, and affect waters and wetlands of varying quality, from severely degraded to performing one or more functions to a high degree. Nationwide permit activities may result in permanent or temporary losses of aquatic resources, or partial or complete losses of aquatic resources. Therefore, it is difficult to predict all of the direct and indirect impacts that may be associated with each activity authorized by an NWP. For example, the NWP that authorizes 25 cubic yard discharges of dredged or fill material into various types of waters of the United States may be used to fulfill a variety of project purposes, and the direct and indirect effects may vary depending on the specific activity and the environmental characteristics of the site in which the activity takes place. Therefore, certain NWPs require pre-construction notification for certain activities to provide district engineers the opportunity to review proposed activities on a case-by-case basis and determine whether they will result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects.

Indication that a factor is not relevant to a particular NWP does not necessarily mean that the NWP would never have an effect on that factor, but that it is a factor not readily identified with the authorized activity. Factors may be relevant, but the adverse effects on the aquatic environment are negligible, such as the impacts of a boat ramp on water level fluctuations or flood hazards. Consistent with 40 CFR 1501.8(g), only the reasonably foreseeable effects or impacts that have a reasonably close causal relationship to the activities authorized as a result of the issuance of this NWP are evaluated in detail in the environmental assessment for this NWP. Division and district engineers will impose, as necessary, additional conditions on the NWP authorization or exercise discretionary authority to address regionally or locally important factors or to ensure that the authorized activity results in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. In any case, adverse effects will be controlled by the terms, conditions, and additional provisions of the NWP. For example, Section 7 Endangered Species Act consultation will be required for all activities that may affect endangered or threatened species or critical habitat (see 33 CFR 330.4(f) and NWP general condition 18).

In a specific waterbody or a specific area of the ocean (e.g., marine ecoregions (Spalding et al. 2007), division or district engineers may determine that the cumulative adverse environmental effects of activities authorized by this NWP are more than minimal. Division and district engineers will conduct more detailed assessments for geographic areas that are determined to be potentially subject to more than minimal cumulative adverse environmental effects. Division and district engineers have the authority to require individual permits in waterbodies, marine

ecoregions, or other geographic areas where the cumulative adverse environmental effects are determined to be more than minimal, or add conditions to the NWP either on a case-by-case or regional basis to require mitigation measures to ensure that the cumulative adverse environmental effects of these activities are no more than minimal. When a division or district engineer determines, using local or regional information, that a waterbody, marine ecoregion, or other geographic area is subject to more than minimal cumulative adverse environmental effects due to the use of this NWP, he or she will use the revocation and modification procedure at 33 CFR 330.5. In reaching the final decision, the division or district engineer will compile information on the cumulative adverse effects and supplement the information in this document.

The Corps expects that the convenience and time savings associated with the use of this NWP will encourage applicants to design their projects within the scope of the NWP rather than request individual permits for projects which could result in greater adverse impacts to the aquatic environment. The minimization encouraged by the issuance of this NWP, as well as compensatory mitigation that may be required for specific activities authorized by this NWP, is likely to help reduce cumulative effects to the Nation's wetlands, streams, and other aquatic resources.

5.2 Impact Analysis

This NWP authorizes structures in navigable waters of the United States, including federal waters over the outer continental shelf, for seaweed mariculture activities, including multi-trophic mariculture activities (e.g., the production of seaweed and bivalve molluscs on the same structure or nearby structure that is part of a single and complete project). For seaweed mariculture activities and multi-trophic mariculture systems in coastal waters and in federal waters on the outer continental shelf, under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 the Corps regulates structures and work in navigable waters of the United States. For the purposes of Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the term "structure" is defined at 33 CFR 322.2(b) as including, "without limitation, any pier, boat dock, boat ramp, wharf, dolphin, weir, boom, breakwater, bulkhead, revetment, riprap, jetty, artificial island, artificial reef, permanent mooring structure, power transmission line, permanently moored floating vessel, piling, aid to navigation, or any other obstacle or obstruction." For seaweed mariculture activities, structures that require section 10 permits include long-lines, floats, rafts, moorings, and anchors. Seaweeds may be grown from lines that drop from rafts. For multi-trophic mariculture activities, structures that require section 10 permits include long-lines, bags, floats, rafts, moorings, and anchors. Seaweeds may be grown from lines that drop from rafts and bivalves may be grown on long lines or in bags or other types of structures. There may be other structural components used for cultivating seaweeds that also require section 10 permits. The long lines and rafts are generally located near the water surface, where there is sufficient light for photosynthesis. "Work" is defined at 33 CFR 322.2(c) as including, "without limitation, any dredging or disposal of

dredged material, excavation, filling, or other modification of a navigable water of the United States.” Seaweed mariculture activities are not likely to involve these categories of work, since these activities are conducted in open waters and the structures are usually attached to the seabed by anchors or other devices.

Structures in navigable waters may alter the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of those waters, but they generally do not result in a loss in the quantity of navigable waters. Structures and work in navigable waters may alter the ecological functions and services provided by those waters. Those alterations will vary, depending on the specific characteristics of the aid to navigation authorized by this NWP and the environmental setting in which the NWP activity may occur. The environmental setting will vary from site to site, by region, and across the country.

The authority of the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, to prevent obstructions to navigation in navigable waters of the United States was extended to artificial islands, installations, and other devices located on the seabed, to the seaward limit of the outer continental shelf, by section 4(f) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 as amended (43 U.S.C. 1333(e)). Therefore, structures used for seaweed mariculture activities in federal waters on the outer continental shelf require section 10 permits from the Corps if they are attached to the seabed on the outer continental shelf.

Kelp cultivation may involve the use of long lines or lines suspended from rafts (Campbell et al. 2019a). Long-lines installed in navigable waters to cultivate seaweeds are considered structures that require section 10 authorization. Rafts may also require section 10 authorization if they are anchored to the bottom of the waterbody to hold them in place while the cultivated seaweeds grow until they are harvested. Long-lines and rafts authorized under this NWP, as well as other structures authorized under other NWP for multi-species operations, can be obstructions that can affect the public’s use of navigable waters and thus require section 10 authorization from the Corps. Kelp sporophytes or gametophytes may be seeded to lines, or sporophytes may be bound to lines through a binding substance, and those lines are then suspended in the water column where there is sufficient light to facilitate optimal growth. The mature kelps may be harvested several months later and processed into various products. Other methods may be used for cultivation of green and red seaweeds, such as “seed” that consists of pieces of green or red seaweed that is attached to long-lines where those pieces can grow into larger seaweeds (Waters et al. 2019).

The operation of the seaweed mariculture activity will likely involve activities that do not require DA authorization because they are not regulated by the Corps under its permitting authority under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, such as the addition or removal of seaweed from long lines or rafts and potential use of chemicals to control fouling organisms. Harvesting of seaweeds does not constitute “work” under the Corps’ definition of that term at 33 CFR 322.2(c). At this time, the most commonly produced seaweeds in the world are brown algae, such as kelps

(e.g., *Saccharina japonica*) and red algae (*Euclima sp.*) (Campbell et al. 2019a). Other types of algae may be cultivated in the future, and other species may be cultivated with seaweeds during multi-trophic mariculture activities.

The impacts of mariculture activities in coastal waters should be evaluated in the context of the coastal waters and the watersheds that drain to those coastal waters (Soto et al. 2008). The severity of environmental impacts caused by seaweed mariculture activities is likely to be influenced by the scale of those cultivation activities within a location or region (Campbell et al. 2019a) and whether or not the operation includes the cultivation of other species such as bivalve molluscs. The impacts of these activities can also be reduced through careful and thoughtful site selection, by avoiding areas with environmental importance (Gentry et al. 2016).

Pre-construction notification is required for all activities authorized by this NWP. The pre-construction notification requirement allows district engineers to review proposed activities on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects of those activities are no more than minimal. If the district engineer determines that the adverse environmental effects of a particular project are more than minimal after considering mitigation, then discretionary authority will be asserted and the applicant will be notified that another form of DA authorization, such as a regional general permit or individual permit, is required (see 33 CFR 330.4(e) and 330.5).

The potential impacts of activities authorized by this NWP on the Corps' public interest review factors listed in 33 CFR 320.4(a)(1) are discussed in more detail in section 6.0 of this document.

The terms of this NWP, including any acreage limits or any other quantitative limits in the text of the NWP, the protections provided by many of the NWP general conditions, plus any regional conditions imposed by division engineers and activity-specific conditions imposed by district engineers will help ensure that the activities authorized by this NWP result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. An additional safeguard is the ability of district engineers to exercise discretionary authority and require project proponents to obtain individual permits for proposed activities whenever a district engineer determines that a proposed activity will result in more than minimal individual or cumulative adverse environmental effects after considering any mitigation proposed by the applicant (see 33 CFR 330.1(e)(3)).

The Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA regulations at 40 CFR 1508.1(g) defines "effects or impacts" as "changes to the human environment from the proposed action or alternatives that are reasonably foreseeable and have a reasonably close causal relationship to the proposed action or alternatives, including those effects that occur at the same time and place as the proposed action or alternatives and may include effects that are later in time or farther removed in distance from the proposed action or alternatives." Furthermore, 40

CFR 1508.1(g)(2) states that:

[a] “but for” causal relationship is insufficient to make an agency responsible for a particular effect under NEPA. Effects should generally not be considered if they are remote in time, geographically remote, or the product of a lengthy causal chain. Effects do not include those effects that the agency has no ability to prevent due to its limited statutory authority or would occur regardless of the proposed action.

Therefore, the impact analysis in this environmental assessment focuses on the impacts or effects that are reasonably foreseeable and have a reasonably close causal relationship to the activities authorized by this NWP under the Corps’ permitting authorities (i.e., work in navigable waters regulated under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and/or discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act).

After the seaweed mariculture structures and multi-trophic mariculture structures (e.g., long lines, rafts, anchors, and other lines and structures) are installed in navigable waters of the United States, there will be environmental impacts that are caused by the operation of the seaweed mariculture facility or multi-trophic mariculture facility that was authorized by this NWP. Operation of the seaweed mariculture facility will involve placing algae seed on lines they can grow to a suitable size for sale to restaurants, processing facilities, markets, and other entities, or to produce a variety of products. Operation of the multi-trophic mariculture facility will involve placing algae seed on lines and young bivalves on lines or in bags or other structures so that they can grow to a suitable size for sale to restaurants, processing facilities, markets, and other entities, or to produce a variety of products. Various species of native and non-native seaweeds may be cultivated at these facilities. Operations may change if seaweed cultivation is part of a multi-species project. The Corps does not have the authority to regulate these operational activities, even though these activities may have a “but for” causal relationship to the activities permitted under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Since the Corps does not have the authority to prevent or control the environmental impacts caused by those “but for” operational activities, the Corps does not have to conduct detailed analyses of these operational activities under the current NEPA definition of “effects” at 40 CFR 1508.1(g)(2). As discussed elsewhere in this document, there may be other federal agencies that have the legal authority to regulate some operational components of seaweed mariculture activities. Other operational components of seaweed mariculture activities might not be regulated by any federal, state, or local government agency.

The individual environmental impacts are the environmental impacts caused by the activities authorized by this NWP, including the direct and indirect impacts caused by the specific NWP activity at the project site. In the context of the Corps’ public interest review (33 CFR 320.4(a)(1) and the Corps’ regulations for section 10

general permits at 33 CFR 322.2(f), the cumulative environmental impacts are the environmental impacts caused by the activities authorized by this NWP during the 5-year period the NWP is anticipated to be in effect. Both the individual and cumulative environmental impacts are evaluated against the current environmental setting, which is described at a national scale in section 4.0 of this document. The current environmental setting varies substantially throughout the United States. In some areas of the country, the current environmental setting is the result of substantial alteration of waterbodies and other ecosystems by various human activities, but in other areas of the country, the current environmental setting has been less affected by various human activities, and those alterations are more subtle and more difficult to discern (Clewell and Aronson 2013). The categories of human activities and natural factors that have altered aquatic ecosystems are discussed in section 4.4 of this document, and are summarized in Table 4.6. The types of ecological functions and services provided by aquatic ecosystems also vary considerably by region and by specific ecosystems, with some ecosystems performing ecological functions and services to a high degree, and other ecosystems performing ecological functions and services to a lesser degree.

The analysis of environmental consequences in this environmental assessment is a qualitative analysis because of the lack of quantitative data at a national scale on the various human activities and natural factors that may concurrently alter the current environmental setting during the 5-year period this NWP is expected to be in effect. As discussed in section 4.4, the activities authorized by this NWP are just one category among many categories of human activities and natural factors that affect ocean waters, estuarine waters, lakes, wetlands, streams, and other aquatic resources, and the ecological functions and services they provide.

As discussed in section 4.0 of this document and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005c), all ecosystems have been affected by human activities to some degree. According to Clewell and Aronson (2013), anthropogenic and natural disturbances to ecosystems can be placed in three categories: (1) stress with maintenance of ecosystem integrity; (2) moderate disturbance where the ecosystem can recover in time through natural processes; and (3) impairment, which may result in a more severe disturbance that may require human intervention (e.g., restoration) to prevent the ecosystem from changing into an alternative, perhaps less functional ecological state. Ecosystems can often tolerate gradual changes and continue to provide ecological functions and services before those changes reach a threshold, that when crossed, causes the ecosystem to change abruptly into an alternative stable state (Scheffer et al. 2001). For some ecosystems, multiple impacts or disturbances can cause an ecosystem to pass a threshold can result in substantial changes to that ecosystem, but for other ecosystems the changes may be more subtle (Folke et al. 2004). It is difficult to predict where these thresholds are, and ecosystems may exhibit little change before that threshold is reached (Scheffer et al. 2009).

The severity of potential impacts to aquatic resources caused by NWP activities is

dependent, in part, on ecosystem resilience and resistance, whether the permitted impacts are temporary or permanent, and how the affected resources respond to the permitted impacts. Impacts to aquatic resources caused by NWP activities may result in a partial, total, or no loss of aquatic resource functions and services, depending on the specific characteristics of the NWP activity and the environmental setting in which those impacts occur. In addition, the duration of the adverse effects (temporary or permanent) caused by NWP activities, can be influenced by the resilience and resistance of the aquatic resource to disturbances caused by those NWP activities. Since there is considerable variation across the country in terms of the types of aquatic resources, the ecological functions and services they provide, and their resilience and resistances to disturbances caused by NWP activities, other human activities, and natural disturbances, the environmental consequences of the issuance of this NWP will vary by site and by region. Given the geographic scope in which this NWP can be used to authorize activities that require DA authorization and the wide variability in aquatic resource structure, functions, and dynamics from site to site and from region to region, the analysis of environmental consequences is a qualitative analysis.

The severity of potential impacts to aquatic resources caused by NWP activities is dependent, in part, on ecosystem resilience and resistance, whether the permitted impacts are temporary or permanent, and how the affected resources respond to the permitted impacts. Impacts to aquatic resources caused by NWP activities may result in a partial, total, or no loss of aquatic resource functions and services, depending on the specific characteristics of the NWP activity and the environmental setting in which those impacts occur. In addition, the duration of the adverse effects (temporary or permanent) caused by NWP activities, can be influenced by the resilience and resistance of the aquatic resource to disturbances caused by those NWP activities. Since there is considerable variation across the country in terms of the types of aquatic resources, the ecological functions and services they provide, and their resilience and resistances to disturbances caused by NWP activities, other human activities, and natural disturbances, the environmental consequences of the issuance of this NWP will vary by site and by region. Given the geographic scope in which this NWP can be used to authorize activities that require DA authorization and the wide variability in aquatic resource structure, functions, and dynamics from site to site and from region to region, there are also considerable challenges in characterizing the potential environmental consequences of the issuance of this NWP at a national scale, including the paucity of data on aquatic resources and the degree to which those aquatic resources provide ecological functions and services. Therefore, this evaluation of environmental consequences is a general evaluation and the NWPs provide mechanisms for more robust analyses at the site-specific scale (i.e., through the review of pre-construction notifications and voluntary requests for NWP verifications) and regional scale (i.e., the division engineer's ability to modify, suspend, or revoke NWP authorizations on a regional basis).

The environmental effects or impacts that are likely to be caused by individual activities authorized by this NWP are evaluated against the current environmental

setting (i.e., the affected environment, which is described at a national scale in section 4.0 of this document). The current environmental setting is the result of human activities altering ecosystems over thousands of years (Perring and Ellis 2013), as well as natural changes in environmental conditions that have occurred over time. Since historical baselines (i.e., the state of ecosystems in the absence of modifications caused by human activities) no longer exist in most areas, ecosystem management decisions should be made by using contemporary baselines that acknowledge how humans have dominated and changed ecosystems over long periods of time (Kopf et al. 2015). Permit decisions are an example of management decisions for ecosystems such as oceans, estuaries, lakes, rivers, streams, and wetlands, where the proposed impacts that require a permit are evaluated against the current environmental setting to decide whether the permit (e.g., an NWP authorization) should be issued by the regulatory authority.

The impacts of activities authorized by this NWP during the 5-year period it is anticipated to be in effect are evaluated against the current affected environment, to determine the potential severity of those anticipated impacts in light of the human alterations and natural changes to aquatic ecosystems that have occurred over time and space. This evaluation takes into account how the activities authorized by this NWP might affect aquatic ecosystems, the resilience of aquatic ecosystems, and the ability of aquatic ecosystems to continue to provide ecological functions and services after the authorized activities have occurred. When evaluating pre-construction notifications, district engineers should be taking into account the current environmental setting, as well as how the jurisdictional waters and wetlands might respond as a result of conducting the NWP activity, including how resilient those waters and wetlands are to disturbances caused by discharges of dredged or fill material and/or structures or work in navigable waters.

Compensatory mitigation required by district engineers for specific activities authorized by this NWP may help reduce the contribution of those activities to the cumulative effects caused by NWPs on the Nation's wetlands, streams, and other aquatic resources, by providing ecological functions to partially or fully replace some or all of the aquatic resource functions lost as a result of those activities. Mitigation requirements, including compensatory mitigation requirements for the NWPs, are described in general condition 23. Compensatory mitigation projects must also comply with the applicable provisions of 33 CFR part 332. District engineers will establish compensatory mitigation requirements on a case-by-case basis, after evaluating pre-construction notifications. Compensatory mitigation requirements for individual NWP activities will be specified through permit conditions added to NWP authorizations. When compensatory mitigation is required, the permittee is required to submit a mitigation plan prepared in accordance with the requirements of 33 CFR 332.4(c). Credits from approved mitigation banks or in-lieu fee programs may also be used to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for NWP authorizations. Monitoring is required to demonstrate whether the permittee-responsible mitigation project, mitigation bank, or in-lieu fee project is meeting its objectives and providing the intended aquatic resource structure and functions. If the compensatory

mitigation project is not meeting its objectives, adaptive management will be required by the district engineer. Adaptive management may involve taking actions, such as site modifications, remediation, or design changes, to ensure the compensatory mitigation project meets its objectives (see 33 CFR 332.7(c)).

The estimated use of this NWP during the 5-year period the NWP is expected to be in effect and the estimated impacts to wetlands, streams, and other aquatic resources in the United States, plus the estimated acreage of compensatory mitigation, is provided in this section of this document. Division and district engineers will monitor the use of this NWP on a regional and case-specific basis, and under their authorities in 33 CFR 330.5(c) and (d), modify, suspend, or revoke NWP authorizations in situations when the use of the NWP will result in more than minimal cumulative adverse environmental effects. Because the activities authorized by this NWP constitute only a small proportion of the categories of human activities that directly and indirectly affect ocean and estuarine waters, the activities authorized by this NWP over the next 5 years are likely to result in only a minor incremental change to the current environmental setting for ocean and estuarine waters and the ecological functions and services they provide.

Under 33 CFR 330.4(f)(2), for an NWP activity proposed by a non-federal permittee, the district engineer will review the pre-construction notification and if she or he determines the proposed NWP activity may affect listed species or designated critical habitat, section 7 consultation will be conducted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (U.S. FWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) depending on which species the district engineer determined may be affected by the proposed NWP activity. During the ESA section 7 consultation process the U.S. FWS or NMFS will evaluate the effects caused by a proposed NWP activity, the environmental baseline, the status of the species and critical habitat, and the effects of any future state or private activities that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area. For formal ESA section 7 consultations, the U.S. FWS or NMFS will formulate their opinion as to whether the proposed NWP activity is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat (see 50 CFR 402.14(g)). The ESA section 7 consultation requirements may also be fulfilled through informal consultation, when the U.S. FWS or NMFS provide their written concurrence that the proposed activity is not likely to adversely affect endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitat (see 50 CFR 402.13(c)). The project proponent may be required to obtain separate incidental take authorizations under the Marine Mammals Protection Act.

When determining whether a proposed NWP activity will cause no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects, the district engineer will consider the direct and indirect effects caused by the NWP activity. He or she will also consider the cumulative adverse environmental effects caused by activities authorized by the NWP and whether those cumulative adverse environmental effects are no more than minimal. The district engineer will also

consider site specific factors, such as the environmental setting in the vicinity of the NWP activity, the type of resource that will be affected by the NWP activity, the functions provided by the aquatic resources that will be affected by the NWP activity, the degree or magnitude to which the aquatic resources perform those functions, the extent that aquatic resource functions will be lost as a result of the NWP activity (e.g., partial or complete loss), the duration of the adverse effects (temporary or permanent), the importance of the aquatic resource functions to the region (e.g., watershed or ecoregion), and mitigation required by the district engineer. If an appropriate functional or condition assessment method is available and practicable to use, that assessment method may be used by the district engineer to assist in the minimal adverse environmental effects determination. These criteria are listed in the NWPs in Section D, "District Engineer's Decision." The district engineer may add case-specific special conditions to the NWP authorization to address site-specific environmental concerns.

Additional conditions can be placed on proposed activities on a regional or case-by-case basis by division or district engineers to ensure that the activities have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. Regional conditions added to this NWP will be used to account for differences in aquatic resource functions, services, and values across the country, ensure that the NWP authorizes only those activities with no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects, and allow each Corps district to prioritize its workload based on where its efforts will best serve to protect the aquatic environment. Regional conditions can prohibit the use of an NWP in certain waters (e.g., high value waters or specific types of wetlands or waters. Specific NWPs can also be revoked on a geographic or watershed basis where the individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects resulting from the use of those NWPs are more than minimal.

In high value waters, division and district engineers can: 1) prohibit the use of the NWP in those waters and require an individual permit or regional general permit; 2) impose an acreage limit for the NWP; 3) add regional conditions to the NWP to ensure that the individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects are minimal; or 4) for those NWP activities that require pre-construction notification, add special conditions to NWP authorizations, such as compensatory mitigation requirements, to ensure that the adverse environmental effects are minimal. Nationwide permits can authorize activities in high value waters as long as the individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects are minimal.

The construction and use of fills for temporary access for construction may be authorized by NWP 33 or regional general permits. The related activity must meet the terms and conditions of the specified permit(s). If the activity is dependent on portions of a larger project that require an individual permit, this NWP will not apply. [See 33 CFR 330.6(c) and (d)]

The impacts of activities authorized by this NWP during the 5-year period it is

anticipated to be in effect are evaluated against the current affected environment, to determine the potential severity of those anticipated impacts in light of the human alterations to aquatic ecosystems that have occurred over time and space. This evaluation takes into account how the activities authorized by this NWP might affect aquatic ecosystems, the resilience of aquatic ecosystems, and the ability of marine and estuarine ecosystems to continue to provide ecological functions and services after the authorized activities have occurred. When evaluating pre-construction notifications, district engineers should be taking into account the current environmental setting, as well as how the jurisdictional waters might respond as a result of the implementation of the NWP activity, including how resilient those waters are to disturbances caused by structures or work in navigable waters.

The Corps estimates that this NWP will be used approximately 5 times per year on a national basis, with the installed structures resulting in impacts to 10 acres of marine and estuarine coastal waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf. The demand for these types of activities could increase or decrease over the five-year duration of this NWP. Activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to require compensatory mitigation because they will not cause losses of waters. Verified activities that do not require compensatory mitigation will have been determined by Corps district engineers to result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment without compensatory mitigation.

Based on these annual estimates, the Corps estimates that approximately 25 activities could be authorized over a five year period until this NWP is likely to expire, resulting in impacts to approximately 50 acres of coastal waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf. Compensatory mitigation will likely not be required to offset these impacts, because those impacts do not result in losses of waters. In addition, the installation of seaweed mariculture structures and multi-trophic mariculture structures is likely to occupy a small proportion of the sea bed and those structures must be removed when they are no longer needed for seaweed production or multi-trophic mariculture production. Most of these structures will be suspended on the water column, and the cultivated seaweeds (and bivalves for multi-trophic mariculture activities) will provide some ecological functions and services. Compensatory mitigation is the restoration (re-establishment or rehabilitation), establishment, enhancement, and/or in certain circumstances preservation of aquatic resources for the purposes of offsetting unavoidable adverse impacts which remain after all appropriate and practicable avoidance and minimization has been achieved. [33 CFR 332.2] Other forms of mitigation (e.g., avoidance and minimization) may be required for activities authorized by this NWP. The demand for these types of activities could increase or decrease over the five-year duration of this NWP. The authorized impacts are expected to result in only minor changes to the affected environment (i.e., the current environmental setting), which is described in section 4.0 of this document.

Mitigation required by district engineers for specific activities authorized by this

NWP may help reduce the contribution of those activities to the cumulative effects on the Nation's marine and estuarine waters, by providing ecological functions to partially or fully replace some or all of the aquatic resource functions lost as a result of those activities. Mitigation requirements, including compensatory mitigation requirements for the NWPs are described in general condition 23. Compensatory mitigation required by district engineers for the activities authorized by this NWP must also comply with the applicable provisions of 33 CFR part 332. District engineers will establish mitigation requirements on a case-by-case basis, after evaluating pre-construction notifications. Mitigation requirements for individual NWP activities will be specified through permit conditions added to NWP authorizations. When compensatory mitigation is required, the permittee is required to submit a mitigation plan prepared in accordance with the requirements of 33 CFR 332.4(c). Credits from approved mitigation banks or in-lieu fee programs may also be used to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for NWP authorizations. Monitoring is required to demonstrate whether the permittee-responsible mitigation project, mitigation bank, or in-lieu fee project is meeting its objectives and providing the intended aquatic resource structure and functions. If the compensatory mitigation project is not meeting its objectives, adaptive management will be required. Adaptive management may involve taking actions, such as site modifications, remediation, or design changes, to ensure the compensatory mitigation project meets its objectives (see 33 CFR 332.7(c)).

5.3 Impact Analysis for Alternatives to the Proposed Action

5.3.1 No Action Alternative (Do Not Issue the Nationwide Permit)

The no action alternative would not achieve one of the goals of the Corps' Nationwide Permit Program, which is to regulate with little, if any, delay or paperwork certain activities having minimal impacts (33 CFR 330.1(b)). The no action alternative would also reduce the Corps' ability to pursue the current level of review for other activities that have greater adverse effects on the aquatic environment, including activities that require individual permits as a result of division or district engineers exercising their discretionary authority under the NWP program. The no action alternative would also reduce the Corps' ability to conduct compliance actions.

If this NWP is not available, substantial additional resources would be required for the Corps to evaluate these minor activities through the individual permit process, and for the public and federal, tribal, and state resource agencies to review and comment on the large number of public notices for these activities. In a considerable majority of cases, when the Corps publishes public notices for proposed activities that result in no more than minimal adverse environmental effects, the Corps typically does not receive responses to these public notices from either the public or federal, tribal, and state resource agencies. Therefore, processing individual permits for these minimal impact activities is not likely to result

in substantive changes to those activities. Another important benefit of the NWP program that would not be achieved through the no action alternative is the incentive for project proponents to design their projects so that those activities meet the terms and conditions of an NWP. The Corps believes the NWPs have significantly reduced adverse effects to the aquatic environment because most applicants modify their activities that require DA authorization to comply with the NWPs and avoid the longer permit application review times and larger costs typically associated with the individual permit process.

Under the no action alternative, district engineers may issue regional general permits or programmatic general permits to authorize similar categories of activities that would have no more than minimal adverse environmental effects that could have been authorized by this NWP. However, those regional general permits or programmatic general permits may have different quantitative limits, different restrictions, and other permit conditions, and those quantitative limits, restrictions, and permit conditions may result in the authorization of activities that have greater, similar, or lesser adverse environmental effects than the activities that would have been authorized by this NWP. Under the no action alternative, there may be differences in consistency in implementation of the Corps Regulatory Program among Corps districts. District engineers can tailor their regional general permits and programmatic general permits to effectively address the specific categories of aquatic resources found in their geographic areas of responsibility, the specific categories of activities that occur in those geographic areas, and the ecological functions and services those categories of aquatic resources provide. The environmental consequences of this aspect of the no action alternative are more difficult to predict because of the potential variability of regional general permits and programmatic general permits among Corps districts across the country, when such general permits are available to authorize a similar category of activities as this NWP authorizes.

If this NWP is not issued, districts would have to draft, propose, and issue regional general permits or programmatic general permits through the public notice and comment process and prepare applicable environmental documentation to support their decisions on whether to issue those regional general permits or programmatic general permits. It would take a substantial amount of time to issue those regional general permits and programmatic general permits, and in the interim proposed activities would have to be authorized through the individual permit process.

5.3.2 Issue the Nationwide Permit With Modifications

This NWP was developed to authorize structures in navigable waters of the United States, including federal waters on the outer continental shelf, for seaweed mariculture activities that have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. The Corps has considered changes to the terms and conditions of this NWP suggested by comments received in response to the proposed rule, as well as modifying or adding NWP general conditions, as

discussed in section 1.4 of this document and the preamble of the Federal Register notice announcing the issuance of this NWP.

The environmental consequences of changing the terms and conditions of the proposed NWP may vary, depending on whether modifications for the issued NWP are more restrictive, less restrictive, or is similarly restrictive compared to the proposal. The environmental consequences of changing the terms and conditions of this NWP are also dependent on the application of existing tools used to ensure that activities authorized by this NWP will only have no more than minimal adverse environmental effects. Those tools include the quantitative limits of the NWP, the pre-construction notification process, and the ability of division and district engineers to modify, suspend, or revoke this NWP on a regional or case-by-case basis.

Changing the national terms and conditions of this NWP may change the incentives for project proponents to reduce their proposed impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands to qualify for NWP authorization, and receive the required DA authorization for regulated activities in less time than it would take to receive individual permits for those activities. Under the individual permit process, the project proponent may request authorization for activities that have greater impacts on jurisdictional waters and wetlands, and may result in larger losses of aquatic resource functions and services.

The environmental consequences of division engineers exercising their discretionary authority to modify, suspend, or revoke this NWP on a regional basis may be a reduction in the number of activities that could be authorized by this NWP in a region or more NWP activities requiring pre-construction notification through regional changes in the PCN requirements for this NWP. The environmental consequences are likely to include reduced losses of waters of the United States because regional conditions can only further condition or restrict the applicability of an NWP (see 33 CFR 330.1(d)). The modification, suspension, or revocation of this NWP on a regional basis by division engineers may also reduce the number of activities authorized by this NWP, which may increase the number of activities that require standard individual permits. If more activities require standard individual permits, permitted losses of jurisdictional waters and wetlands may increase because standard individual permits have no quantitative limits.

An environmental consequence of regional conditions added to the NWPs by division engineers is the enhanced ability to address differences in aquatic resource functions, services, and values among different regions across the nation. Corps divisions may add regional conditions to the NWPs to enhance protection of the aquatic environment in a region (e.g., a Corps district, state, or watershed) and address regional concerns regarding jurisdictional waters and wetlands and other resources (e.g., listed species or cultural resources) that may be affected or impacted by the activities authorized by this NWP. Division engineers can also revoke an NWP in a region if the use of that NWP results in more than minimal

adverse environmental effects, especially in high value or rare waters or wetlands. When an NWP is issued or reissued by the Corps, division engineers issue supplemental documents that evaluate potential impacts of the NWP at a regional level, and assess cumulative impacts caused by this NWP on a regional basis during the period this NWP is in effect. [33 CFR 330.5(c)]

An environmental consequence of district engineers modify, suspending, or revoking this NWP on a case-by-case basis is the ability of district engineers to address site-specific conditions, including the degree to which aquatic resources on the project site provide ecological functions and services. Activity-specific modifications may also address site-specific resources (e.g., listed species or cultural resources) that may be affected by NWP activities. The environmental consequences of modification of this NWP on an activity-specific basis by district engineers may be further reductions in losses of waters of the United States for specific activities authorized by NWP because of mitigation required by district engineers during their reviews of PCNs to ensure that those activities result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects (see 33 CFR 330.1(e)(3)). If a proposed NWP activity will result in more than minimal adverse environmental effects, then the district engineer will exercise discretionary authority and require an individual permit. The individual permit review process requires a project-specific alternatives analysis, including the consideration of off-site alternatives, and a public interest review.

5.3.3 Issue the Nationwide Permit Without Modifications

Issuing the NWP as proposed would likely result in little or no changes in the number of activities authorized by this NWP, and the environmental impacts of authorized activities. Project proponents would likely continue to design their project to qualify for NWP authorization. Finalizing the proposed national terms and conditions of this NWP would likely continue to provide incentives for project proponents to reduce their proposed impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands to qualify for NWP authorization, and receive the required DA authorization for regulated activities in less time than it would take to receive individual permits for those activities. Under this alternative, for those activities that require individual permits project proponents may request authorization for activities that have greater impacts on jurisdictional waters and wetlands, and may result in larger impacts to aquatic resource functions and services.

Under this alternative, the environmental consequences of division engineers exercising their discretionary authority to modify, suspend, or revoke this NWP on a regional basis would be similar to the environmental consequences discussed in section 5.3.2. Corps divisions may add regional conditions to the NWPs to enhance protection of the aquatic environment in a region (e.g., a Corps district, state, or watershed) and address regional concerns regarding jurisdictional waters and wetlands and other resources (e.g., listed species or cultural resources) that may be affected or impacted by the activities authorized by this NWP. Division engineers

can also revoke an NWP in a region if the use of that NWP results in more than minimal adverse environmental effects, especially in high value or rare waters or wetlands. When an NWP is issued or reissued by the Corps, division engineers issue supplemental documents that evaluate potential impacts of the NWP at a regional level, and assess cumulative impacts caused by this NWP on a regional basis during the period this NWP is in effect. [33 CFR 330.5(c)]

Under this alternative, the ability of district engineers to modify, suspended, or revoke this NWP on a case-by-case to address site-specific conditions, including the degree to which aquatic resources on the project site provide ecological functions and services, is likely to have environmental consequences similar to the environmental consequences of the alternative identified in section 3.2. Activity-specific modifications under this alternative may also address site-specific resources (e.g., listed species or cultural resources) that may be affected by NWP activities. Activity-specific modifications may also include mitigation requirements similar to the potential mitigation requirements discussed in section 5.3.2.

The issuance of this NWP adopts the alternative identified in section 3.2 of this document. The Corps has considered the comments received in response to the proposed rule, and made changes to the NWPs, general conditions, and definitions to address those comments. Division engineer may add regional conditions to this NWP to help ensure that the use of the NWPs in a particular geographic area will result in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. District engineers may also add regional conditions to this NWP to help ensure compliance with other applicable laws, such as Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the essential fish habitat provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Division engineers may also add regional conditions to this NWP to fulfill its tribal trust responsibilities.

Corps divisions and districts also monitor the use of this NWP and the authorized impacts identified in NWP verification letters. At a later time, if warranted, a division engineer may add regional conditions to further restrict or prohibit the use of this NWP to ensure that it does not authorize activities that result in more than minimal adverse environmental effects in a particular geographic region (e.g., a watershed, landscape unit, or seascape unit). To the extent practicable, division and district engineers will use regulatory automated information systems and institutional knowledge about the typical adverse effects of activities authorized by this NWP, as well as substantive public comments, to assess the individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects resulting from regulated activities authorized by this NWP.

6.0 Public Interest Review

6.1 Public Interest Review Factors (33 CFR 320.4(a)(1))

For each of the 20 public interest review factors, the extent of the Corps consideration of expected impacts resulting from the use of this NWP is discussed, as well as the reasonably foreseeable cumulative adverse effects that are expected to occur. The Corps decision-making process involves consideration of the benefits and detriments that may result from the activities authorized by this NWP.

(a) Conservation. The activities authorized by this NWP are likely to cause only minor changes to the natural resource characteristics of oceanic and coastal waters, since seaweed mariculture activities do not cause losses of these waters and the structures used for mariculture likely cause little change in the ecological functions and services these waters provide. Locating seaweed mariculture activities in degraded coastal waters has the potential to help improve the ability of those waters to provide ecosystem services such as habitat and nutrient reduction (water quality) (Alleway et al. 2019). However, seaweed mariculture activities can transfer diseases, alter the population genetics of seaweeds, and cause changes to local environmental conditions (Campbell et al. 2019a). Beneficial and/or adverse effects of mariculture operations will also vary based on whether multiple species are cultivated.

Seaweed mariculture activities may involve the cultivation of non-native species. Non-native species may pose risks to local and regional marine and estuarine ecosystems if they become aquatic nuisance species. Once a non-native species is introduced into an area, it may be difficult to eradicate at a later time (Campbell et al. 2019a). The most effective means of avoiding the adverse effects of non-native species introduction is to not introduce them in the first place (Shackelford et al. 2013). The risks of non-native species can be reduced by implementing cultivation practices that utilize native species and taking actions to reduce potential introductions of non-native species (Campbell et al. 2019a). Potential biosecurity issues could be addressed by revising international biosecurity measures to minimize the potential risks of spreading diseases, pests, and non-native species that can occur as a result of seaweed mariculture activities (Campbell et al. 2019b). The Corps does not have the legal authority to address these types of biosecurity issues.

(b) Economics. Seaweed mariculture activities will have positive impacts on the local economy. These activities are likely to generate jobs and revenue for local growers as well as revenue to supply companies that sell materials used for these activities. Seaweed mariculture is a relatively new enterprise in North America, and it has the potential to contribute to market demands for new protein sources and food supplements (Kim et al. 2017). Seaweed mariculture activities supply seafood for restaurants and other consumers. The authorized mariculture structures, and the seaweeds grown on those structures, are likely to benefit the community by improving the local economic base, which is affected by employment, tax revenues, community services, and property values.

Seaweed mariculture activities may serve to reinvigorate economic activity in coastal communities where economic activities have been declining because of changes to fisheries (Hasselström et al. 2018). Integrated multi-trophic mariculture activities can provide additional jobs (Troell et al. 2009), and this NWP authorizes the cultivation of other groups of organisms (e.g., bivalve molluscs) along with seaweeds. Seaweed mariculture activities can provide jobs and other economic benefits in isolated communities, as well as communities that are impoverished or otherwise disadvantaged (Alleway et al. 2019). Seaweed mariculture activities can help support indigenous and traditional communities in their efforts to continue customary ways of life (Alleway et al. 2019).

The profitability of offshore seaweed farms, including those involving integrated multi-tropic mariculture activities, is dependent on cultivating seaweed species that can demand higher prices, such as sea vegetables, seaweeds with medicinal benefits, and seaweeds that can provide components for cosmetics (Troell et al. 2009).

Seaweeds produced through seaweed mariculture activities can provide raw materials for making complex materials, pharmaceuticals, food ingredients, foods, and biofuels (Campbell et al. 2019a, Hasselström et al. 2018), which can provide economic value for communities. Seaweed mariculture activities can provide materials (e.g., pharmaceuticals, agar, texturizing agents, and biofuels) that can be valued economic commodities (Alleway et al. 2019).

(c) Aesthetics. Seaweed mariculture activities may alter the visual character of some waters of the United States. The extent and perception of these changes will vary, depending on the size and configuration of the mariculture activity, the nature of the surrounding area, and the public uses of the area. The use of the project area and the surrounding land may also alter local aesthetic values. Shafer et al. (2010) found that people who live closest to nearshore mariculture facilities tended to have negative perceptions about those facilities, while acknowledging the economic benefits mariculture operations can have for local communities. Seaweed mariculture operators may discard equipment, such as lines, anchors, and floats that impair the aesthetics of the waters and shoreline in the vicinity of the operation. Artificial materials used for seaweed mariculture activities, such as synthetic lines and plastic floats, may contribute to marine pollution if they are not properly disposed of after use or they break away from the mariculture facility during a storm or other event, or through negligence (Campbell et al. 2019a). When these materials become part of marine pollution, they can wash onto shorelines or in accumulate in nearshore waters and have adverse effects on the aesthetic qualities of the area (Campbell et al. 2019a).

General condition 13 requires the removal of temporary structures and fills after completion of the authorized activity. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the Corps does not regulate the placement of trash or garbage into waters of the United

States, because trash or garbage is specifically excluded from the definition of “fill material” at 33 CFR 323.2(e). Discharges of trash or garbage into waters of the United States, including navigable waters, may be regulated by EPA and approved states under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. Section 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which gave the Corps the authority to regulate the deposition of refuse in navigable waters was superseded by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is administered by EPA and states with approved programs. General condition 14 requires proper maintenance of authorized structures, which may also help reduce contributions of seaweed mariculture activities to marine pollution.

Seaweed mariculture activities in nearshore coastal waters may affect the visual, acoustic, and olfactory characteristics of coastal areas near these activities. Some coastal residents and visitors may perceive these effects as being positive or neutral, whereas other residents or visitors may perceive these effects as negative. These perceptions may depend, in part, on the history of the coastal area and whether it has long-standing traditions of fishing and mariculture activities (NRC 2010). Siting mariculture operations in federal waters on the outer continental shelf can reduce or eliminate these effects on aesthetics by making them distant from coastal populations.

Seaweed mariculture activities conducted in nearshore coastal waters may have adverse effects on aesthetics, as perceived by some members of coastal communities and some visitors to those communities (Hasselström et al. 2018). Other members of coastal communities or visitors may have positive or neutral perceptions of effects on local aesthetics caused by these activities. The operation of seaweed mariculture facilities may alter the aesthetics of the area by increasing noise from increase vessel traffic from boats used for installing and maintaining the seaweed mariculture structures, and vessels used for seaweed seeding and harvesting activities (Campbell et al. 2019a). The degree of change above ambient noise levels will likely depend on the degree vessel traffic increases in the vicinity of the seaweed mariculture facility, which may be proportional to the size of the seaweed mariculture operation.

(d) General environmental concerns. Activities authorized by this NWP will affect general environmental concerns, such as water, air, noise, and land pollution. The authorized activities will also affect the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the aquatic environment. The Corps believes the adverse effects of the activities authorized by this NWP on general environmental concerns will be minor based on the assumption that projects will be small in scale and considering only seaweed mariculture rather than multi-species mariculture projects. Cultivated seaweeds may improve general environmental concerns, such as water and habitat quality, within navigable waters by removing nutrients from the water column in waters subject to eutrophication and by providing physical structure to the waterbody that can be used as habitat by some aquatic organisms (Alleway et al. 2019). Adverse effects to the chemical composition of the aquatic environment will be controlled by general condition 6, which states that the material used for

construction must be free from toxic pollutants in toxic amounts. General condition 23 requires mitigation to minimize adverse effects to the aquatic environment through avoidance and minimization at the project site. Mitigation may be required by district engineers to ensure that the net adverse effects on the aquatic environment are minimal. Specific environmental concerns are addressed in other sections of this document.

The environmental impacts of mariculture activities should not be considered in isolation, since there are a variety of human activities that also cause environmental impacts to coastal waters, and the environmental impacts of mariculture activities may be fairly small relative to the environmental impacts caused by other activities such as industrial activities (Soto et al. 2008) and the environmental impacts caused by shipping activities and cruises.

Seaweed mariculture activities can provide a temporary carbon sink, and its duration as a carbon sink is dependent on what the cultivated seaweed is used for and how quickly the carbon is released back into the environment as carbon dioxide (Hasselström et al. 2018). Seaweed mariculture activities can remove carbon dioxide, with negligible adverse effects on the chemistry of marine waters and the buffering capacity of those waters (Campbell et al. 2019a). Thoughtfully planned and sustainable mariculture activities can help provide conservation values (Froehlich et al. 2017).

The potential adverse effects that seaweed mariculture activities have on primary production in coastal and oceanic waters may be minimized by siting these operations in locations where the carrying capacity of these environments in terms of nutrient availability are not exceeded (Campbell et al. 2019a), especially in coastal waters that are subject to eutrophication. The activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to cause coastal habitat loss because the seaweed mariculture structures are located off-shore in coastal waters or in federal waters over the outer continental shelf. This NWP does not authorize any support facilities or other attendant features along the shoreline that may be used to support seaweed mariculture activities. The construction or expansion of support facilities or other attendant features would require separate Department of the Army authorization under section 10 and/or section 404.

The design of seaweed mariculture activities, along with operational standards (e.g., stocking densities, rotational practices, biosecurity measures), can help reduce the adverse effects of these activities on marine and coastal environments and facilitate the ecosystem services provided by these activities (Alleway et al. 2019). These operational standards may be adopted and implemented by growers voluntarily, but many of these operational standards are not reasonably enforceable by the Corps under its permitting authority under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.

Artificial materials, such as synthetic (e.g., polypropylene) ropes and plastic floats,

may contribute to marine pollution if they are accidentally lost from the seaweed mariculture facility as a result of storms, negligence, or other causes (Campbell et al. 2019a). General condition 13 requires the removal of temporary structures after the authorized work is completed. Under its authorities, the Corps does not regulate the placement of trash or garbage in navigable waters. Section 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which gave the Corps the authority to regulate the deposition of refuse into navigable waters, was superseded by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is administered by states with EPA-approved programs or by EPA itself.

(e) Wetlands. The seaweed mariculture activities authorized by this NWP may result in some impacts to seagrasses, through shading and the installation of long-lines. The activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to have direct effects on tidal fringe wetlands, since these activities are conducted in relatively deep water. In many cases the impacts will be temporary since the seaweed mariculture activities primarily occur in marine and estuarine coastal waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf. This NWP does not authorize attendant features that might result in the loss of wetlands, such as boat ramps, stockpiles, or staging areas. It is unlikely that losses of wetlands will occur as a result of the activities authorized by this NWP, although there may be some temporary wetland impacts.

Wetlands provide habitat, including foraging, nesting, spawning, rearing, and resting sites for aquatic and terrestrial species. The loss or alteration of wetlands may alter natural drainage patterns. Wetlands reduce erosion by stabilizing the substrate. Wetlands also act as storage areas for stormwater and flood waters. The loss of wetland vegetation will adversely affect water quality because these plants trap sediments, pollutants, and nutrients and transform chemical compounds. Wetland vegetation also provides habitat for microorganisms that remove nutrients and pollutants from water. Wetlands, through the accumulation of organic matter, act as sinks for some nutrients and other chemical compounds, reducing the amounts of these substances in the water.

Seagrasses provide important ecological functions and services such as organic carbon production and export, nutrient cycling, sediment stabilization, enhanced biodiversity, and transfers of energy between adjacent habitats (Orth et al. 2006). Dumbauld and McCoy (2015) identified the following ecological functions performed by seagrasses: enhanced biodiversity, structured habitat for fish and invertebrates (nurseries, refuge from predation), sediment accretion and erosion control by dampening water currents, carbon sequestration, and foraging areas for waterfowl and shorebirds.

The activities authorized by this NWP may physically disturb seagrass beds (Campbell et al. 2019a), and might adversely affect their persistence and growth. Seaweed mariculture activities may have shading effects on benthic organisms, including seagrasses and algae (Campbell et al. 2019a, Hasselstrom et al. 2018). The effects would depend on which types of benthic organisms are present in the footprint of the seaweed mariculture activity. The shading caused by seaweed

mariculture activities may also have adverse effects on phytoplankton (Campbell et al. 2019a), and reduce their productivity, growth, and reproduction. Shading impacts on phytoplankton are likely to be temporary for small and medium sized operations, as the phytoplankton drift to waters where there are no seaweed mariculture activities. Shading impacts may be more severe for large-scale seaweed mariculture activities as there is likely to be competition for light between the cultivated seaweeds and the phytoplankton. District engineers will review pre-construction notifications for proposed activities and evaluate potential effects on seagrasses and naturally occurring algae. The seaweeds cultivated through seaweed mariculture activities may compete for nutrients that are needed for phytoplankton, benthic macroalgae, and seagrasses (Campbell et al. 2019a), and may reduce their availability for their growth.

General condition 23 requires avoidance and minimization of impacts to waters of the United States, including wetlands, at the project site. Division engineers can regionally condition this NWP to restrict or prohibit the use of this NWP in high value tidal wetlands. District engineers will also exercise discretionary authority to require an individual permit if the wetlands to be filled are high value and the activity will result in more than minimal adverse environmental effects. District engineers can also add case-specific special conditions to the NWP authorization to provide protection to wetlands.

(f) Historic properties. General condition 20 states that in cases where the district engineer determines that the activity may affect properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, the activity is not authorized, until the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act have been satisfied.

(g) Fish and wildlife values. This NWP authorizes activities in marine and estuarine coastal waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf, which provide habitat to many species of fish and wildlife. Activities authorized by this NWP may alter the habitat characteristics of tidal waters. Tidal waters, including tidal wetlands and vegetated shallows, provides food and habitat for many species, including foraging areas, resting areas, corridors for fish movement, and nesting and breeding grounds. Open waters provide habitat for fish and other aquatic organisms. Equipment used for seaweed mariculture activities, such as long lines, may interfere with bird feeding activity and trap birds, as would equipment in multi-species operations. Pre-construction notification is required for all activities authorized by this NWP. The pre-construction notification requirement provides the district engineer with an opportunity to review those activities and assess potential impacts on fish and wildlife values and ensure that the authorized activity results in no more than minimal adverse environmental effects.

Seaweeds can provide habitat, including nursery, feeding, and refuge habitat, for a number of species, including fish, crustaceans, echinoderms, other invertebrates, and other seaweeds (Christie et al. 2009). The cultivated species can provide many

of the same ecosystem functions and services as wildly occurring species (Froehlich et al. 2017). The habitat structure provided by seaweed mariculture activities may help increase local populations of fish species, including those species that are sought by commercial and recreational fishers (Hasselström et al. 2018). For example, the anchors for long lines used for seaweed mariculture activities may provide habitat for fish and crustaceans (Hasselström et al. 2018). However, lines may also increase entanglement risk for marine animals, as well as negative interactions with operators if the structures serve as fish attracting devices. The structural habitat and habitat complexity provided by seaweed mariculture activities may attract a variety of finfish and invertebrate species (Campbell et al. 2019a). The increase in structural habitat and habitat complexity can provide benefits for a variety of marine species, such as increased food resources. Seaweed mariculture activities may increase opportunities for foraging for some aquatic organisms, by providing structural habitat that attracts prey species (Campbell et al. 2019a).

Seaweed mariculture activities may also affect food webs in coastal waters, as various species of fish and wildlife interact with the cultivated seaweeds (Hasselström et al. 2018). The adverse effects on primary production (e.g., shading of seagrasses and benthic algae) caused by seaweed mariculture activities may have subsequent adverse effects on secondary production in these waters, because lower levels of primary production may result in lower levels of secondary production for aquatic organisms that consume benthic phytoplankton and macroalgae (Campbell et al. 2019a).

Seaweed mariculture structures and the seaweeds grown on those structures may also alter water flows in benthic and pelagic habitats, potentially altering the abiotic characteristics of those habitats, such as surface boundary conditions and water chemistry (Campbell et al. 2019a). Seaweed mariculture activities may contribute particulate organic matter and dissolved organic matter to marine and estuarine waters, which can add energy to food webs in those ecosystems (Campbell et al. 2019a). Particulate and dissolved organic matter may be transported some distance from the seaweed mariculture activity and serve as an energy source for organisms that do not live near the facility. The potential for changes in water quality would be influenced by the inclusion of multi-species mariculture projects. Multi-species mariculture is often designed to mitigate water quality and benthic impacts through waste recovery or transformation by co-cultured species (Reid et al. 2011). Particulate organic matter may be released naturally through fall-offs or break-offs, or as a result of mechanical disturbance during harvesting activities. Dissolved organic matter from seaweed mariculture activities can serve as an energy source for phytoplankton and bacterioplankton (Campbell et al. 2019a.)

Seaweed mariculture activities may act as barriers to migration for marine mammals (Campbell et al. 2019a), and should not be located in migratory routes. Bird species may utilize increased foraging opportunities at seaweed mariculture facilities (Campbell et al. 2019a), and these facilities may provide increased habitat value for

birds. Seaweed mariculture activities may replace existing natural habitats with novel man-made habitats (e.g., long-lines). These structures may provide artificial structural habitat that benefits a number of marine and organisms, and the cultivated seaweeds may provide some habitat benefits as well (Campbell et al. 2019a). Seaweed mariculture activities may indirectly cause decreases in fish biomass if the mariculture structures attract fish and those fish become easier to capture by humans or other predators (Alleway et al. 2019).

Animals, such as marine mammals, large fish, and marine turtles could become entangled in lines and other structures used for seaweed mariculture activities (Campbell et al. 2019a). Birds may also become entangled in these lines. Some seaweed mariculture activities may involve the use of nets, which can also pose entanglement or entrapment risks for large and small animals (Campbell et al. 2019a). Multi-species mariculture projects can also pose entanglement and entrapment risks depending on the design of nets. Entanglement can cause mortality or injury to these vertebrates. The risk of entanglement can be reduced, but not eliminated, by increasing tension to anchor lines and other lines used for seaweed mariculture activities. The risk of entanglement can also be reduced by siting seaweed mariculture activities in areas that are not heavily used by marine vertebrates for foraging, migration, and reproduction. The risk of entanglement can also be reduced by keeping lines taut so that they do not get wrapped around the bodies of marine mammals, birds, and turtles and cause those organisms harm.

Seaweed mariculture structures, as well as structures used in multi-species projects, may have potential interactions with marine mammals (e.g., entanglement, habitat exclusion, and behavioral modification). These effects may be short to long-term and may be characterized by attraction or avoidance depending on the species present (Clement 2013). These activities may require incidental take authorization (i.e., a letter of authorization or an incidental harassment authorization) from NMFS under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. If the marine mammal that might potentially be affected by the proposed seaweed mariculture activity is also a listed species under the Endangered Species Act, section 7 consultation will be required in addition to the processing of an application for an incidental take authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

All activities authorized by this NWP require pre-construction notification to the district engineer. District engineers will review these pre-construction notifications and determine whether proposed activities may affect endangered or threatened species or designated critical habitat for those species. If the district engineer determines, after reviewing the PCN, that the proposed activity “may affect” listed species or critical habitat, then she or he will initiate Endangered Species Act section 7 consultation with NMFS or FWS. The section 7 consultation may result in permit conditions intended to avoid or minimize impacts to listed species or designated critical habitat.

Compliance with general condition 2 will reduce adverse effects to fish and other

aquatic species by prohibiting activities that substantially disrupt the movement of indigenous aquatic species, unless the primary purpose of the activity is to impound water. Compliance with general conditions 3 and 5 will ensure that the authorized activity has no more than minimal adverse effects on spawning areas and shellfish beds, respectively. The authorized activity cannot have more than minimal adverse effects on breeding areas for migratory birds, due to the requirements of general condition 4.

For an NWP activity, compliance with the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668(a)-(d)), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703; 16 U.S.C. 712), and the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) is the responsibility of the project proponent. General condition 19 states that the permittee is responsible for contacting the appropriate local office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine applicable measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds or eagles, including whether “incidental take” permits are necessary and available under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act for a particular activity.

Consultation pursuant to the essential fish habitat provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act will occur as necessary for proposed activities authorized by this NWP that may adversely affect essential fish habitat. Consultation may occur on a case-by-case or regional programmatic basis. Division and district engineers can impose regional and special conditions to ensure that activities authorized by this NWP will result in only minimal adverse effects on essential fish habitat.

(h) Flood hazards. The activities authorized by this NWP are likely to have little or no adverse effects on the flood-holding capacity of 100-year floodplains, since these activities occur in either marine or estuarine coastal waters or in federal waters on the outer continental shelf.

(i) Floodplain values. Activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to have adverse effects on the flood-holding capacity of floodplains, as well as other floodplain values, since it authorizes only seaweed mariculture activities in estuarine and marine waters, including federal waters over the outer continental shelf. All activities authorized by this NWP require pre-construction notification, and district engineers will review all proposed activities to ensure that those activities result in no more than minimal adverse effects on floodplain values.

(j) Land use. Activities authorized by this NWP will have little or no adverse effect on land use, since it only authorizes structures in navigable waters of the United States for seaweed mariculture activities in estuarine and marine waters, including federal waters on the outer continental shelf. For proposed activities on the outer continental shelf, the project proponent may have to obtain a lease or other type of permission from the U.S. Department of the Interior. For proposed activities in the territorial seas, states that own the submerged lands in coastal waters may require project proponents to obtain leases or other forms of permission to conduct these

activities. Since the primary responsibility for land use decisions is held by state, local, and tribal governments, the Corps' control and responsibility is limited to significant issues of overriding national importance, such as navigation and water quality (see 33 CFR 320.4(j)(2)). People who live near coastal areas where mariculture activities may occur and who directly use those waters for recreational purposes tend to have more concerns about these activities (Shafer et al. 2010) than people who live farther away and are less likely to use these waters for recreation.

(k) Navigation. Activities authorized by this NWP are likely to have only minor adverse effects on navigation, because all activities must comply with general condition 1. Seaweed mariculture activities need to occur near the water surface, so that the seaweeds get sufficient light for photosynthesis and growth, so there may be potential effects on navigation (Troell et al. 2009). Seaweed mariculture structures in an anchorage area established by the U.S. Coast Guard must comply with the requirements in 33 CFR 322.5(l)(2). This NWP prohibits seaweed mariculture structures in established danger zones or restricted areas designated in 33 CFR part 334, federal navigation channels, and shipping safety fairways or traffic separation schemes established by the U.S. Coast Guard (see 33 CFR 322.5(l)(1)). All activities authorized by this NWP require pre-construction notification, which will allow district engineers to review those activities and determine if there will be any adverse effects on navigation, including potential conflicts with other users of navigable waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf.

Under paragraph (c) of NWP general condition 1, the permittee may be required, upon due notice from the Corps of Engineers, to remove, relocate, or alter the structural work or obstructions caused thereby, without expense to the United States. The Corps may require these actions if, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army or his or her authorized representative, the structure or work will cause unreasonable obstruction to the free navigation of the navigable waters.

(l) Shore erosion and accretion. The activities authorized by this NWP are likely to have only minor direct adverse effects on shore erosion and accretion processes, since the NWP is limited to seaweed mariculture activities that occur in marine and estuarine coastal waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf. Nearshore seaweed mariculture activities may alter hydrodynamics in coastal waters (Campbell et al. 2019a; Hasselström et al. 2018), and may dampen wave energy and currents so that there is less erosion in nearby shorelines. The structures used for seaweed mariculture activities may absorb and deflect tidal and wave energy, and alter flow conditions in near shore environments, which may cause changes in local geomorphology (Alleway et al. 2019; Campbell et al. 2019a). The seaweeds cultivated with the structures authorized by this NWP may also help attenuate wave energy (Alleway et al. 2019) and reduce shore erosion. Nationwide permit 13, regional general permits, or individual permits may be used to authorize bank stabilization projects associated with seaweed mariculture activities. The effects of those bank stabilization projects on shore erosion and accretion will be

evaluated through that authorization process.

(m) Recreation. Activities authorized by this NWP may result in minor changes on the recreational uses of the area. Certain recreational activities, such as bird watching, hunting, and fishing may still be available in the area, and birds and fish may be attracted to the seaweed mariculture structures and the seaweeds growing on those structures (Hasselström et al. 2018). Seaweed mariculture activities conducted in nearshore coastal waters may affect recreational activities, such as fishing, boating, and swimming activities. Seaweed mariculture activities may provide structural habitat that attracts species of interest to recreational divers, potentially enhancing recreational diving opportunities (Hasselström et al. 2018). Seaweed mariculture activities can adversely affect recreational values of coastal waters by acting as a physical impediment to recreational activities (Hasselström et al. 2018), such as recreational boat use and swimming. Those impacts can be temporary depending on how long the structures used for seaweed mariculture activities, such as long lines, buoys, and anchors, remain in place. The NWP requires removal of the authorized structures if they will no longer be used for seaweed mariculture activities or multi-trophic mariculture activities.

(n) Water supply and conservation. Activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to adversely affect surface water and groundwater supplies, because these activities occur in marine and estuarine waters. These waters are generally not used for water supply, except in areas where desalination plants convert seawater into potable water. The activities authorized by this NWP are not likely to increase demand for potable water in the region. Many causes of water pollution, such as discharges regulated under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, are outside the Corps' control and responsibility.

(o) Water quality. Seaweed mariculture activities may have some minor adverse effects on water quality, but in general they are likely to help improve water quality by sequestering nutrients from the water column into seaweed biomass and reducing nutrient loads (Hasselström et al. 2018). For example, cultivated seaweeds can remove nitrogen and phosphorous from the water column and reduce eutrophication (Hasselström et al. 2018). Larger scale seaweed mariculture activities can help reduce excess nutrient loads in coastal waters, and improve water quality and reduce the adverse effects of eutrophication of waterbodies and ocean acidification (Campbell et al. 2019a). Seaweed mariculture may be conducted alongside finfish mariculture through integrated multi-trophic mariculture activities can help improve water quality because the seaweeds can assimilate nutrients excreted as waste material from the cultivated finfish (Troell et al. 2009), and help reduce nutrient loads in the vicinity of the overall mariculture operation. This balance depends on the design of the project in terms of the scale of finfish versus seaweed cultivation.

During seaweed mariculture activities, small amounts of oil and grease from production or harvesting equipment may be discharged into the waterway. Because

most production or harvesting activities will occur during a relatively short period of time, the frequency and concentration of these discharges are not expected to have more than minimal adverse effects on overall water quality.

(p) Energy needs. The activities authorized by this NWP are anticipated to result in negligible changes in energy consumption in the area, because the NWP authorizes only certain aspects of seaweed mariculture activities, specifically structures or work in navigable waters. Therefore, consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum products is unlikely to change because of activities authorized by this NWP. Growers may use boats to harvest seaweeds and maintain the structures authorized by this NWP, which may require energy to move those boats.

(q) Safety. The activities authorized by this NWP will be subject to Federal, state, and local safety laws and regulations. Therefore, the authorized activities are unlikely to adversely affect safety within the project area.

(r) Food and fiber production. Activities authorized by this NWP will normally increase food production, through the production of seaweeds. For example, substances extracted from seaweeds may be used for processed foods. Seaweed mariculture activities can provide new protein sources and healthy food supplements, plus textural additives for processed foods (Kim et al. 2017). Therefore, seaweed mariculture activities can augment food production in the United States. Red algae may be cultivated to produce carrageenan, a food thickening substance that is used in food, drinks, and pharmaceuticals (Campbell et al. 2019b). The activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to contribute to fiber production. These activities will not change the amount of available agricultural land in the nation because these activities are conducted in coastal waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf. Seaweed mariculture activities may interfere with commercial and recreational fishing activities by excluding fishers from the waters where those mariculture activities occur, potentially interfering with food gathering activities. On the other hand, the seaweeds cultivated on the structures authorized by this NWP, and the structures themselves, may provide habitat that attracts fish that may be caught by local fishers.

(s) Mineral needs. Activities authorized by this NWP are likely to have little or no adverse effects on demand for aggregates and stone, since these materials are usually not used for seaweed mariculture activities. An exception may be stones and aggregates that may be used to make anchors for long lines used for seaweed mariculture activities. Activities authorized by this NWP may increase the demand for other materials, such as steel, aluminum, and copper, which are made from mineral ores, for structures and cables used for seaweed mariculture structures.

(t) Considerations of property ownership. The activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to have negative impacts on property ownership because they occur in marine and estuarine coastal waters and federal waters on the outer continental shelf. Project proponents may be required to obtain permits, leases, or other forms

of permission to conduct these activities on state-owned submerged lands, or federally managed areas of the outer continental shelf. The NWP provides streamlined DA authorization for seaweed mariculture activities, provided those activities comply with the terms and conditions of the NWP and result in no more than minimal adverse environmental effects.

6.2 Additional Public Interest Review Factors (33 CFR 320.4(a)(2))

6.2.1 Relative extent of the public and private need for the proposed structure or work

This NWP authorizes structures in navigable waters of the United States, including federal waters on the outer continental shelf, for seaweed mariculture activities and multi-trophic mariculture activities involving seaweeds and bivalves as long as those activities have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects. These activities satisfy public and private needs for food and other products. The need for this NWP is based upon the number of these activities that occur annually with only minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects.

6.2.2 Where there are unresolved conflicts as to resource use, the practicability of using reasonable alternative locations and methods to accomplish the objective of the proposed structure or work

Most situations in which there are unresolved conflicts concerning resource use arise when environmentally sensitive areas are involved (e.g., special aquatic sites, including wetlands) or where there are competing uses of a resource. The nature and scope of the activity, when planned and constructed in accordance with the terms and conditions of this NWP, reduce the likelihood of such conflict. In the event that there is a conflict, the NWP contains provisions that are capable of resolving the matter (see Section 1.2 of this document).

General condition 23 requires permittees to avoid and minimize adverse effects to waters of the United States to the maximum extent practicable on the project site. Consideration of off-site alternative locations is not required for activities that are authorized by general permits. General permits authorize activities that have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the environment and the overall public interest. The district engineer will exercise discretionary authority and require an individual permit if the proposed activity will result in more than minimal adverse environmental effects on the project site. The consideration of off-site alternatives can be required during the individual permit process.

6.2.3 The extent and permanence of the beneficial and/or detrimental effects which the proposed structure or work is likely to have on the public and private uses to which the area is suited

The nature and scope of the activities authorized by the NWP will most likely restrict the extent of the beneficial and detrimental effects to the area immediately surrounding the seaweed mariculture activity. Activities authorized by this NWP cannot have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects.

The terms, conditions, and provisions of the NWP were developed to ensure that individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects are no more than minimal. Specifically, NWPs do not obviate the need for the permittee to obtain other Federal, state, or local authorizations required by law. The NWPs do not grant any property rights or exclusive privileges (see 33 CFR 330.4(b) for further information). Additional conditions, limitations, restrictions, and provisions for discretionary authority, as well as the ability to add activity-specific or regional conditions to this NWP, will provide further safeguards to the aquatic environment and the overall public interest. There are also provisions to allow suspension, modification, or revocation of the NWP.

7.0 Endangered and Threatened Species

No activity is authorized by any NWP if that activity is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species as listed or proposed for listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), or to destroy or adversely modify the critical habitat of such species (33 CFR 330.4(f)). If the district engineer determines a proposed NWP activity may affect listed species or designated critical habitat, he or she will conduct ESA section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as appropriate. The proposed NWP activity is not authorized until the ESA section 7 consultation process is completed or the district engineer determines the proposed NWP activity will have no effect on listed species or designated critical habitat. Current local procedures in Corps districts are effective in ensuring compliance with ESA. Those local procedures include regional programmatic consultations and the development of Standard Local Operating Procedures for Endangered Species (SLOPES). The issuance or reissuance of an NWP, as governed by NWP general condition 18 (which applies to every NWP and which relates to endangered and threatened species and critical habitat) and 33 CFR 330.4(f), results in “no effect” to listed species or critical habitat, because no activity that “may affect” listed species or critical habitat is authorized by NWP unless ESA Section 7 consultation with the USFWS and/or NMFS has been completed. If the non-federal project proponent does not comply with 33 CFR 330.4(f)(2) and general condition 18, and does not submit the required PCN, then the activity is not authorized by NWP. In such situations, it is an unauthorized activity and the Corps district will determine an appropriate course of action under its regulations at 33 CFR part 326 to respond to the unauthorized activity. Unauthorized activities may also be subject to the prohibitions of Section 9 of the

ESA.

Each activity authorized by an NWP is subject to general condition 18, which states that “[n]o activity is authorized under any NWP which is likely to directly or indirectly jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species or a species proposed for such designation, as identified under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), or which will directly or indirectly destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat or critical habitat proposed for such designation.” In addition, general condition 18 explicitly states that the NWP does not authorize “take” of threatened or endangered species, which will ensure that permittees do not mistake the NWP authorization as a Federal authorization to take threatened or endangered species. General condition 18 also requires a non-federal permittee to submit a pre-construction notification to the district engineer if any listed species or designated critical habitat (or proposed species or proposed critical habitat) might be affected or is in the vicinity of the project, or if the project is located in designated or proposed critical habitat. The Corps established the “might affect” threshold in 33 CFR 330.4(f)(2) and paragraph (c) of general condition 18 because it is more stringent than the “may affect” threshold for section 7 consultation in the USFWS’s and NMFS’s ESA section 7 consultation regulations at 50 CFR part 402. The word “might” is defined as having “less probability or possibility” than the word “may” (Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 10th edition). Since “might” has a lower probability of occurring, it is below the threshold (i.e., “may affect”) that triggers the requirement for ESA section 7 consultation for a proposed Federal action. This general condition also states that, in such cases, non-federal permittees shall not begin work on the activity until notified by the district engineer that the requirements of the ESA have been satisfied and that the activity is authorized.

Under the current Corps regulations (33 CFR 325.2(b)(5)), the district engineer must review all permit applications for potential impacts on threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. For the NWP program, this review occurs when the district engineer evaluates the pre-construction notification or request for verification. Nationwide permit general condition 18 requires a non-federal applicant to submit a pre-construction notification to the Corps if any listed species (or species proposed for listing) or designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation) might be affected or is in the vicinity of the project, or if the project is located in designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation). Based on the evaluation of all available information, the district engineer will initiate consultation with the USFWS or NMFS, as appropriate, if he or she determines that the proposed activity may affect any threatened and endangered species or designated critical habitat. Consultation may occur during the NWP authorization process or the district engineer may exercise discretionary authority to require an individual permit for the proposed activity and initiate section 7 consultation during the individual permit process. If the district engineer determines a proposed NWP activity is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any proposed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of proposed critical habitat, he or she will initiate a conference with the USFWS or

NMFS. If ESA Section 7 consultation or conference is conducted during the NWP authorization process, then the applicant will be notified that he or she cannot proceed with the proposed NWP activity until section 7 consultation is completed.

If the district engineer determines that the proposed NWP activity will have no effect on any threatened or endangered species or critical habitat, then the district engineer will notify the applicant that he or she may proceed under the NWP authorization as long as the activity complies with all other applicable terms and conditions of the NWP, including applicable regional conditions. When the Corps makes a “no effect” determination, that determination is documented in the record for the NWP verification.

In cases where the Corps makes a “may affect” determination, formal or informal section 7 consultation is conducted before the activity is authorized by NWP. A non-federal permit applicant cannot begin work until notified by the Corps that the proposed NWP activity will have “no effect” on listed species or critical habitat, or until ESA Section 7 consultation has been completed (see also 33 CFR 330.4(f)). Federal permittees are responsible for complying with ESA Section 7(a)(2) and should follow their own procedures for complying with those requirements (see 33 CFR 330.4(f)(1)). Therefore, permittees cannot rely on complying with the terms of an NWP without considering ESA-listed species and critical habitat, and they must comply with the NWP conditions to ensure that they do not violate the ESA. General condition 18 also states that district engineers may add activity-specific conditions to the NWPs to address ESA issues as a result of formal or informal consultation with the USFWS or NMFS.

Each year, the Corps conducts thousands of ESA section 7 consultations with the USFWS and NMFS for activities authorized by NWPs. These section 7 consultations are tracked in ORM. During the period of March 19, 2017, to October 20, 2020, Corps districts conducted 1,294 formal consultations and 8,233 informal consultations under NWP PCNs where the Corps verified that the proposed activities were authorized by NWP. During that time period, the Corps also used regional programmatic consultations for 21,677 NWP verifications to comply with ESA section 7. Therefore, each year an average of 8,700 formal, informal, and programmatic ESA section 7 consultations are conducted with the USFWS and/or NMFS in response to NWP PCNs, including those activities that required PCNs under paragraph (c) of general condition 18. In a study on ESA section 7 consultations tracked by the USFWS, Malcom and Li (2015) found that during the period of 2008 to 2015, the Corps conducted the most formal and informal section 7 consultations, far exceeding the numbers of section 7 consultations conducted by other federal agencies.

Section 7 consultations are often conducted on a case-by-case basis for activities proposed to be authorized by NWP that may affect listed species or critical habitat, in accordance with the USFWS’s and NMFS’s interagency regulations at 50 CFR part 402. Instead of activity-specific section 7 consultations, compliance with ESA

may also be achieved through formal or informal regional programmatic consultations. Compliance with ESA Section 7 may also be facilitated through the adoption of NWP regional conditions. In some Corps districts SLOPES have been developed through consultation with the appropriate regional offices of the USFWS and NMFS to make the process of complying with section 7 more efficient.

Corps districts have, in most cases, established informal or formal procedures with local offices of the USFWS and NMFS, through which the agencies share information regarding threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat. This information helps district engineers determine if a proposed NWP activity may affect listed species or their critical habitat and, when a “may affect” determination is made, initiate ESA section 7 consultation. Corps districts may utilize maps or databases that identify locations of populations of threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat. Where necessary, regional conditions are added to one or more NWPs to require pre-construction notification for NWP activities that occur in known locations of threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Any information provided by local maps and databases and any comments received during the pre-construction notification review process will be used by the district engineer to make a “no effect” or “may affect” determination for the pre-construction notification.

Based on the safeguards discussed in this section, especially general condition 18 and the NWP regulations at 33 CFR 330.4(f), the Corps has determined that the activities authorized by this NWP will not jeopardize the continued existence of any listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Although the Corps continues to believe that these procedures ensure compliance with the ESA, the Corps has taken some steps to provide further assurance. Corps district offices meet with local representatives of the USFWS and NMFS to establish or modify existing procedures such as regional conditions, where necessary, to ensure that the Corps has the latest information regarding the existence and location of any threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat. Corps districts can also establish, through SLOPES or other tools, additional safeguards that ensure compliance with the ESA. Through ESA Section 7 formal or informal consultations, the Corps ensures that no activity is authorized by any NWP if that activity is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species as listed or proposed for listing under the ESA, or to destroy or adversely modify the critical habitat of such species. Other tools such as SLOPES, the development of regional conditions added to the NWP by the division engineer, and conditions added to a specific NWP authorization by the district engineer help ensure compliance with the ESA.

If informal section 7 consultation is conducted, and the USFWS and/or NMFS issues a written concurrence that the proposed activity may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, listed species or designated critical habitat based on conservation measures incorporated in the project to avoid or minimize potential effects to ESA

resources, the district engineer will add conditions (e.g., conservation measures) to the NWP authorization. If the USFWS and/or NMFS does not issue a written concurrence that the proposed NWP activity “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” listed species or critical habitat, the Corps will initiate formal section 7 consultation if it changes its determination to “may affect, likely to adversely affect.”

If formal section 7 consultation is conducted and a biological opinion is issued, the district engineer will add conditions to the NWP authorization to incorporate appropriate elements of the incidental take statement of the biological opinion into the NWP authorization, if the biological opinion concludes that the NWP activity is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or adversely modify or destroy critical habitat. If the biological opinion concludes that the proposed activity is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or adversely modify or destroy critical habitat, the proposed activity cannot be authorized by NWP and the district engineer will instruct the applicant to apply for an individual permit. The incidental take statement includes reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions such as mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements that minimize incidental take. The Corps will determine which elements of an incidental take statement need to be added to the NWP authorization as permit conditions to fulfill its obligations under Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. The appropriate elements of the incidental take statement are dependent on those activities identified in the biological opinion over which the Corps has control and responsibility (i.e., structures or work in navigable waters and their direct and indirect effects on listed species or critical habitat and/or the discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States). The appropriate elements of the incidental take statement are those reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions that the Corps has the authority to enforce under its permitting authorities. Incorporation of the appropriate elements of the incidental take statement into the NWP authorization through binding, enforceable permit conditions may provide the project proponent an exemption from the take prohibitions in ESA Section 9 (see Section 7(o)(2) of the ESA).

The Corps can modify this NWP at any time that it is deemed necessary to protect listed species or their critical habitat, either through: 1) national general conditions or national-level modifications, suspensions, or revocations of the NWPs; 2) regional conditions or regional modifications, suspensions, or revocations of NWPs; or 3) activity-specific permit conditions (modifications) or activity-specific suspensions or revocations of NWP authorizations. Therefore, although the Corps has issued the NWPs, the Corps can address any ESA issue, if one should arise. The NWP regulations also allow the Corps to suspend the use of some or all of the NWPs immediately, if necessary, while considering the need for permit conditions, modifications, or revocations. These procedures are provided at 33 CFR 330.5.

8.0 Determinations

8.1 Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the information in this document, the Corps has determined that the structures in navigable waters of the United States authorized by the issuance of this NWP will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. During the five-year period this NWP will be in effect, the activities authorized by this NWP will result in only minor changes to the affected environment described in section 4.0 of this environmental assessment. Therefore, the preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required for the issuance of this NWP.

8.2 Public Interest Determination

In accordance with the requirements of 33 CFR 320.4, the Corps has determined, based on the information in this document, that the issuance of this NWP to authorize structures in navigable waters of the United States for seaweed mariculture activities is not contrary to the public interest.

8.3 Compliance with Requirements for Issuance of General Permits under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 CFR 322.2(f))

Based on the information in this document, the Corps has determined that the structures in navigable waters of the United States authorized by this NWP, when conducted in compliance with the conditions included in the NWP authorization, will result in only minor changes to the current environmental setting described in section 4.0 of this document, and will have no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment during the 5-year period this NWP is in effect.

8.4 Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act General Conformity Rule Review

This NWP has been analyzed for conformity applicability pursuant to regulations implementing Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. It has been determined that the activities authorized by this permit will not exceed de minimis levels of direct emissions of a criteria pollutant or its precursors and are exempted by 40 CFR 93.153. Any later indirect emissions are generally not within the Corps continuing

program responsibility and generally cannot be practicably controlled by the Corps.
For these reasons, a conformity determination is not required for this NWP.

FOR THE COMMANDER

Dated: 4 January 2021

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "W H G J R".

William H. Graham Jr.
Major General, U.S. Army
Deputy Commanding General for Civil and
Emergency Operations

9.0 References

- Allan, J.D. 2004. Landscapes and Riverscapes: The Influence of Land Use on Stream Ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 35:257–284.
- Alleway, H.K, C.L. Gillies, M.J. Bishop, R.R. Gentry, S.J. Theuerkauf, and R. Jones. 2019. The ecosystem services of marine aquaculture: Valuing benefits to people and nature. *Bioscience* 69:59-68.
- Backstrom, A.C, G.E. Garrard, R.J. Hobbs, and S.A. Bekessy. 2018. Grappling with the social dimensions of novel ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 16:109-117, doi:10.1002/fee.1769
- Beechie, T. J.S. Richardson, A.M. Gurnell, and J. Negishi. 2013. Watershed processes, human impacts, and process-based restoration. In, *Stream and Watershed Restoration: A Guide to Restoring Riverine Processes and Habitats*. Edited by P. Roni and T. Beechie. Wiley and Sons, Inc. (West Sussex, UK), pp. 11-49.
- Bigelow, D.P. and A. Borchers. 2017. Major Uses of Land in the United States, 2012. EIB-178. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 62 pp.
- Bodkin, D.B. 2012. *The Moon in the Nautilus Shell: Discordant Harmonies Reconsidered from Climate Change to Species Extinction, How Life Persists in an Ever-Changing World*. Oxford University Press (New York, New York). 424 pp.
- Booth, D.B., J.R. Karr, S. Schauman, C.P. Konrad, S.A. Morley, M.G. Larson, and S.J. Burges. 2004. Reviving urban streams: Land use, hydrology, biology, and human behavior. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 40:1351-1364.
- Brinson, M.M. and A.I. Malvárez. 2002. Temperate freshwater wetlands: type, status and threats. *Environmental Conservation* 29:115-133.
- Brooks, R.T. and E.A. Colburn. 2011. Extent and channel morphology of unmapped headwater stream segments of the Quabbin watershed, Massachusetts. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 47:158-168.
- Brown, T.C. and P. Froemke. 2012. Nationwide assessment of non-point source threats to water quality. *Bioscience* 62:136-146.
- Butman, D. and P.A. Raymond. 2011. Significant efflux of carbon dioxide from streams and rivers in the United States. *Nature Geoscience* 4:839–842.
- Campbell, I., A. Macleod, C. Sahlmann, L. Neves, J. Funderud, M. Øverland, A.D.

Hughes, and M. Stanley. 2019a. The Environmental Risks Associated With the Development of Seaweed Farming in Europe - Prioritizing Key Knowledge Gaps. *Frontiers in Marine Science*. 22 pp. [https://doi: 10.3389/fmars.2019.00107](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00107)

Campbell, I., C.S.B. Kambey, J.P. Mateo, S.B. Rusekwa, A.Q. Hurtado, F.E. Msuya, G.D. Stentiford, E.J. Cottier-Cook. 2019b. Biosecurity policy and legislation for the global seaweed aquaculture industry. *Journal of Applied Phycology*. 14 pp. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10811-019-02010-5>

Canter, L.W. 1996. *Environmental Impact Analysis*. 2nd edition. McGraw-Hill (Chapter 4).

Christie, H. K.M. Norderhaug, and S. Fredriksen. 2009. Macrophytes as habitat for fauna. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 396:221–233.

Chapin, S.F., and 16 others. 2010. Ecosystem stewardship: sustainability strategies for a rapidly changing planet. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 25:241-249.

Clarke Murray, C., M.E. Mach, and R.G. Martone, R.G. 2014. Cumulative effects in marine ecosystems: scientific perspectives on its challenges and solutions. WWF-Canada and Center for Ocean Solutions. 60 pp.

Clewell, A.F. and J. Aronson. 2013. *Ecological Restoration: Principles, Values, and Structure of an Emerging Profession*. 2nd edition. Island Press (Washington, DC). Chapter 3, pages 35-36.

Costanza, R., R. de Groot, P. Sutton, S. van der Ploeg, S.J. Anderson, I. Kubiszewski, and R.K. Turner. 2014. Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental Change* 26:152-148.

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997. Considering cumulative effects under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-79-31. 131 pp.

Dahl, T.E. 2011. Status and trends of wetlands in the conterminous United States 2004 to 2009. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC. 108 pp.

Dahl, T.E. and C.E. Johnson. 1991. Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States, Mid-1970s to Mid-1980s. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC. 28 pp.

Dumbauld, B.R. and L.M. McCoy. 2015. Effect of oyster aquaculture on seagrass

Zostera marina at the estuarine landscape scale in Willapa Bay, Washington (USA). *Aquaculture Environment Interactions* 7:29-47.

Dumbauld, B.R., J.L. Ruesink, and S.S. Rumrill. 2009. The ecological role of bivalve shellfish aquaculture in the estuarine environment: A review with application to oyster and clam culture in west coast (USA) estuaries. *Aquaculture* 290:196-223.

Deegan, L.A., D.S. Johnson, R.S. Warren, B.J. Peterson, J.W. Fleeger, S. Fagherazzi, and W.M. Wollheim. 2012. Coastal eutrophication as a driver of salt marsh loss. *Nature* 490:388-392.

Dudgeon, D. A.H. Arthington, M.O. Gessner, Z.-I. Kawabata, D.J. Knowler, C. Lévêque, R.J. Naiman, A.-H. Prieur-Richard, D. Soto, M.L.J. Stiassny, and C.A. Sullivan. 2005. Freshwater biodiversity: importance, threats, status and conservation challenges. *Biological Reviews* 81:163-182.

Ellis, E.C. 2015. Ecology in an anthropogenic biosphere. *Ecological Monographs* 85:287–331.

Ellis, E.C., K.K. Goldewijk, S. Siebert, D. Lightman, and N. Ramankutty. 2010. Anthropogenic transformation of the biomes, 1700 to 2000. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 19:589-606.

Ellis, E.C. and N. Ramankutty. 2008. Putting people in the map: Anthropogenic biomes of the world. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 6:439-447.

Evans, N.M. and M.A. Davis. 2018. What about cultural ecosystems? Opportunities for cultural considerations in the “International Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration.” *Restoration Ecology* 26:612-617.

Federal Geographic Data Committee. 2013. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. FGDC-STD-004-2013. Second Edition. Wetlands Subcommittee, Federal Geographic Data Committee and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.

Fennessy, M.S., A.D. Jacobs, and M.E. Kentula. 2007. An evaluation of rapid methods for assessing the ecological condition of wetlands. *Wetlands* 27:543-560.

Foley, J.A., R. DeFries, G.P. Asner, C. Barford, G. Bonan, S.R. Carpenter, F.S. Chapin, M.T. Coe, G.C. Daily, H.K. Gibbs, J.H. Helkowski, T. Holloway, E.A. Howard, C.J. Kucharik, C. Monfreda, J.A. Patz, I.C. Prentice, N. Ramankutty, and P.K. Snyder. 2005. Global consequences of land use. *Science* 309:570-574.

Folke, C., S.R. Carpenter, B. Walker, M. Scheffer, T. Chapin, and J. Rockstrom. 2010. Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability, and transformability. *Ecology and Society*, volume 15, article 20.

Folke, C. S. Carpenter, B. Walker, M. Scheffer, T. Elmqvist, L. Gunderson, and C.S. Holling. 2004. Regime shifts, resilience, and biodiversity in ecosystem management. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 35:557–81.

Folke, C. and 21 others. 2011. Reconnecting to the biosphere. *AMBIO* 40:719-738.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Rome, 2011. Assessing forest degradation Towards the development of globally applicable guidelines, FAO, Rome (Italy). Forestry Dept.

Frayer, W.E., T.J. Monahan, D.C. Bowden, F.A. Graybill. 1983. Status and Trends of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats in the Conterminous United States: 1950s to 1970s. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Washington, DC. 32 pp.

Froehlich, H.E., R.R. Gentry, and B.S. Halpern. 2017. Conservation aquaculture: Shifting the narrative and paradigm of aquaculture's role in resource management. *Biological Conservation* 215:162-168.

Gebo, N.A. and R.P. Brooks. 2012. Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) assessments of mitigation sites compared to natural reference wetlands in Pennsylvania. *Wetlands* 32:321-331.

Gentry, R.R., S.E. Lester, C.V. Kappel, C. White, T.W. Bell, J. Stevens, and S.D. Gaines. 2016. Offshore aquaculture: Spatial planning principles for sustainable development. *Ecology and Evolution* 7:733-743.

Gittman, R.K, F.J. Fodrie, A.M. Popowich, D.A. Keller, J.F. Bruno, C.A. Currin, C.H. Peterson, and M.F. Piehler. 2015. Engineering away our natural defenses: an analysis of shoreline hardening in the United States. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 13:301-307.

Glasoe, S. and A. Christy. 2004. Coastal urbanization and microbial contamination of shellfish growing areas. Office of the Governor, Puget Sound Action Team. Publication #: PSA T04-09.

Gosselink, J.G. and L.C. Lee. 1989. Cumulative impact assessment in bottomland hardwood forests. *Wetlands* 9:83-174.

Gunderson, L.H. 2000. Ecological resilience – in theory and application. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. 31:425–39.

Halpern, B.S. and 10 others. 2015. Spatial and temporal changes in cumulative human impacts on the world's ocean. *Nature Communications*. 6:7615, doi: 10.1038/ncomms8615

Halpern, B.S., and 18 others. 2008. A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. *Science* 319:948-952.

Hansen, W.F. 2001. Identifying stream types and management implications. *Forest Ecology and Management* 143:39-46.

Hasselström, L., W. Vischc, F. Gröndahla, G.M. Nylundc, and H. Paviac. 2018. The impact of seaweed cultivation on ecosystem services - a case study from the west coast of Sweden. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 133:53–64.

Hobbs, R.J. 2016. Degraded or just different? Perceptions and value judgments in restoration decisions. *Restoration Ecology* 24:153–158.

Hobbs, R.J., and 27 others. 2014. Managing the whole landscape: historical, hybrid, and novel ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 12:557-564.

Hosack, G.R., B.R. Dumbauld, J.L. Ruesink, and D.A. Armstrong. 2006. Habitat associations of estuarine species: Comparisons of intertidal mudflat, seagrass (*Zostera marina*), and oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*) habitats. *Estuaries and Coasts* 29:1150-1160.

Hughes, T.P., and 16 others. 2003. Climate change, human impacts, and the resilience of coral reefs. *Science* 301:929-933.

Karieva, P. S. Watts, R. McDonald, and T. Boucher. 2007. Domesticated nature: Shaping landscapes and ecosystems for human welfare. *Science* 316:1866-1869.

Kettlewell, C.I., V. Bouchard, D. Porej, M. Micacchion, J.J. Mack, D. White, and L. Fay. 2008. An assessment of wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation in the Cuyahoga River watershed, Ohio, USA. *Wetlands* 28:57-67.

Kim, J.K., C. Yarish, E.K. Hwang, M. Park, and Y. Kim. 2017. Seaweed aquaculture: cultivation technologies, challenges and its ecosystem services. *Algae* 32:1-13. <https://doi.org/10.4490/algae.2017.32.3.3>

King, D.M., Wainger, L.A., C.C. Bartoldus, and J.S. Wakeley. 2000. Expanding wetland assessment procedures: Linking indices of wetland function with services and values. ERDC/EL TR-00-17, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

Kopf, R.K., C.M. Finlayson, P. Humphries, N.C. Sims, and S. Hladysz. 2015. Anthropocene baselines: Assessing change and managing biodiversity in human-dominated aquatic ecosystems. *Bioscience* 65:798-811.

Korpinen, S. and J.H. Andersen. 2016. A global review of cumulative pressure and

impact assessment in marine environments. *Frontiers in Marine Science*. Volume 3, Number 153. doi:10.3389/fmars.2016.00153

Leopold, L.B. 1968. Hydrology for urban land planning – A guidebook on the hydrologic effects of urban land use. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey. Geological Survey Circular 554. 18 pp.

Lotze, H.K., H.S. Lenihan, B.J. Bourque, R.H. Bradbury, R.G. Cooke, M.C. Kay, S.M. Kidwell, M.X. Kirby, C.H. Peterson, and J.B.C. Jackson. 2006. Depletion, degradation, and recovery potential of estuaries and coastal seas. *Science* 312:1806-1809.

MacDonald, L.H. 2000. Evaluating and Managing Cumulative Effects: Process and Constraints. *Environmental Management* 26:299–315.

Malcom, J.W. and Y.-W. Li. 2015. Data contradict common perceptions about a controversial provision of the US Endangered Species Act. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 112:15844–15849.

Meyer, J.L. and J.B. Wallace. 2001. Lost linkages and lotic ecology: rediscovering small streams. In *Ecology: Achievement and Challenge*. Ed. by M.C. Press, N.J. Huntly, and S. Levin. Blackwell Science (Cornwall, Great Britain). pp. 295-317.

Millar, C.I. and L.B. Brubaker. 2006. Climate change and paleoecology: New contexts for restoration ecology. In: *Foundations of Restoration Ecology*, edited by D.A. Falk, M.A. Palmer, and J.B. Zedler. Island Press (Washington, DC). Chapter 15, pages 315-340.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). 2005a. Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Wetlands and Water Synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. 68 pp.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). 2005b. Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Current State and Trends, Chapter 19 – Coastal Ecosystems. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. 37 pp.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). 2005c. Ecosystems and human well-being: Biodiversity synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. 86 pp.

Mitsch, W.J. and J.G. Gosselink. 2015. *Wetlands*. 5th edition. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (Hoboken, New Jersey) 736 pp.

Mitsch, W.J. and M.E. Hernandez. 2013. Landscape and climate change threats to wetlands of North and Central America. *Aquatic Sciences* 75:133-149.

Moreno-Mateos, D., M.E. Power, F.A. Comin, R. Yockteng. 2012. Structural and

functional loss in restored wetland ecosystems. *PLoS Biol* 10(1): e1001247.
doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001247

National Academy of Sciences and the Royal Society (NAS and RS). 2019. *Climate change and ecosystems*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
<https://doi.org/10.17226/25504>

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2013. *National Coastal Population Report: Population Trends from 1970 to 2020*. NOAA State of the Coast Report Series. 22 pp.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 1975. *The Coastline of the United States*. [7](#) (accessed October 23, 2014).

National Research Council (NRC). 1986. *Ecological Knowledge and Environmental Problem-Solving: Concepts and Case-Studies*. National Academy Press (Washington, DC). 388 pp.

National Research Council (NRC). 1994. *Priorities for Coastal Ecosystem Science*. National Academy Press (Washington, DC). 118 pp.

National Research Council (NRC). 1995. *Wetlands: Characteristics and Boundaries*. National Academy Press (Washington, DC). 306 pp.

National Research Council (NRC). 2001. *Compensating for Wetland Losses Under the Clean Water Act*. National Academy Press (Washington, DC). 322 pp.

Orth, R.J., T.J.B. Carruthers, W.C. Dennison, C.M. Duarte, J.W. Fourqurean, K.L. Heck, Jr., A.R. Hughes, G.A. Kendrick, W.J. Kenworthy, S. Olyarnik, F.T. Short, M. Waycott, and S.L. Williams. 2006. A global crisis for seagrass ecosystems. *Bioscience* 56:987-996.

Orth, R.J., W.C. Dennison, J.S. Lefcheck, C. Gurbisz, M. Hannam, J. Keisman, J.B. Landry, K.A. Moore, R.R. Murphy, C.J. Patrick, J. Testa, D.E. Weller, and D.J. Wilcox. 2017. Submersed aquatic vegetation in Chesapeake Bay: Sentinel species in a changing world. *Bioscience* 67:698-712.

Palmer, M.A., K.L. Hondula, and B.J. Koch. 2014. Ecological restoration of streams and rivers: Shifting strategies and shifting goals. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 45:247-269.

Paul, M.J. and J.L. Meyer. 2001. Streams in the urban landscape. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. 32:333-365.

Perring, M.P. and E.C. Ellis. 2013. The extent of novel ecosystems: long in time and broad in space. (Chapter 8) In: *Novel Ecosystems: Intervening in the New*

Ecological World Order, by R.J. Hobbs, E.S. Higgs, and C.M. Hall. Wiley-Blackwell (West Sussex, UK). 368 pp.

Peterson, C.H. and J. Lubchenco. 1997. Marine ecosystem services, in *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*. Edited by G.C. Daily. Island Press (Washington, DC). pp. 177-194.

Radeloff, V.C., and 19 others. 2015. The rise of novelty in ecosystems. *Ecological Applications* 25:2015-2068.

Reid, L.M. 1993. Research and cumulative watershed effects. U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report PSW-GTR-141. 118 pp.

Rey Benayas, J.M., A.C. Newton, A. Diaz, and J.M. Bullock. 2009. Enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystems by ecological restoration: a meta-analysis. *Science* 325:1121-1124.

Robb, C.K. 2014. Assessing the impact of human activities on British Columbia's estuaries. *PLOS ONE*, Volume 9, Issue 6, e99578.

Roni, P., K. Hanson, and T. Beechie. 2008. Global review of the physical and biological effectiveness of stream habitat rehabilitation techniques. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 28:856-890.

Roni, P., G. Pess, K. Hanson, and M. Pearsons. 2013. Selecting appropriate stream and watershed restoration techniques. In, *Stream and Watershed Restoration: A Guide to Restoring Riverine Processes and Habitats*. Edited by P. Roni and T. Beechie. Wiley and Sons, Inc. (West Sussex, UK), pp. 144-188.

Royal Society (RS) and the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). 2014. Climate change evidence and causes: An overview from the Royal Society and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. 34 pp.

Ruesink, J.L., B.E. Feist, C.J. Harvey, J.S. Hong, A.C. Trimble, and L.M. Wisehart. 2006. Changes in productivity associated with four introduced species: ecosystem transformation of a "pristine" estuary. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 311:203-215.

Ruesink, J.L., H.S. Lenihan, A.C. Trimble, K.W. Heiman, F. Micheli, J.E. Byers, and M.C. Kay. 2005. Introduction of non-native oysters: Ecological effects and restoration implications. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 36:643-689.

Shackelford, N., R.J. Hobbs, N.E. Heller, L.M. Hallett, and T.R. Seastedt. 2013. Finding a middle-ground: The native/non-native debate. *Biological Conservation* 158:55-62.

Shafer, C.S., G.J. Inglis, and V. Martin. 2010. Examining Residents' Proximity, Recreational Use, and Perceptions Regarding Proposed Aquaculture Development. *Coastal Management* 38:559-574.

Scheffer, M. and 9 others. 2009. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature* 461:53-59.

Scheffer, M., S. Carpenter, J.A. Foley, C. Folke, and B. Walker. 2001. Catastrophic shifts in ecosystems. *Nature* 413:591-596.

Sheppard, C. 2014. *Coral Reefs: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press (New York). 152 pp.

Smith, R.D., Ammann, A., Bartoldus, C., and Brinson, M.M. 1995. An approach for assessing wetland functions using hydrogeomorphic classification, reference wetlands, and functional indices. Technical Report WRP-DE-9, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

Soto, D. and 21 others. 2008. Applying an ecosystem-based approach to aquaculture: principles, scales and some management measures. In D. Soto, J. Aguilar-Manjarrez and N. Hishamunda (eds). *Building an ecosystem approach to aquaculture*. FAO/Universitat de les Illes Balears Expert Workshop. 7–11 May 2007, Palma de Mallorca, Spain. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Proceedings. No. 14. Rome, FAO. pp. 15–35.

Spalding, M.D. and 14 others. 2007. Marine Ecoregions of the World: A Bioregionalization of Coastal and Shelf Areas. *Bioscience* 57:573-583.

Staudt, A. A.K. Leidner, J. Howard, K.A. Brauman, J.S. Dukes, L.J. Hansen, C. Paukert, J. Sabo, and L.A. Solórzano. 2013. The added complications of climate change: understanding biodiversity and ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and Environment* 11:494-501.

Steffen, W., P.J. Crutzen, and J.R. McNeill. 2007. The Anthropocene: Are humans overwhelming the forces of nature? *Ambio* 36:614-621

Stein, E.D., M. Brinson, M.C. Rains, W. Kleindl, and F.R. Hauer. 2009. Wetland assessment alphabet soup: How to choose (or not choose) the right assessment method *Wetland Science and Practice* 26:20-25.

Stevens, L. and others. 2019. Archeological assessment reveals Earth's early transformation through land use. *Science* 365:897-902.

Tallis, H.M. J. Ruesink, B. Dumbauld, S. Hacker, and L.M. Wisehart. 2009. Oysters and aquaculture practices affect eelgrass density and productivity in a Pacific Northwest estuary. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 28:251-261.

Tiner, R.W. 2017. Wetland Indicators: A Guide to Wetland Formation, Identification, Delineation, Classification, and Mapping. 2nd edition. CRC Press (Boca Raton, FL) 606 pp.

Troell, M., A. Joyce, T. Chopin, A. Neori, A.H. Buschmann, and J.-G. Fang. 2009. Ecological engineering in aquaculture – potential for integrated multi-trophic aquaculture (IMTA) in marine offshore systems. *Aquaculture* 297:1-9.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2020. Draft Regulatory Impact Analysis for the proposed 2020 Nationwide Permits. Available at www.regulations.gov in docket number COE-2020-0002.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2018. Summary Report: 2015 National Resources Inventory, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Washington, DC, and Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/nri/15summary> (accessed January 6, 2020)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2015. National Summary of State Information. http://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_index.control (accessed May 27, 2015).

Van Andel, J. and J. Aronson. 2012. Getting Started. Chapter 1 in: Restoration Ecology: The New Frontier. 2nd edition. Edited by J. van Andel and J. Aronson. (Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.)

Van Andel, J. A.P. Grootjans, and J. Aronson. 2012. Unifying Concepts. Chapter 2 in: Restoration Ecology: The New Frontier. 2nd edition. Edited by J. van Andel and J. Aronson. (Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.)

Vitousek, P.M., H.A. Mooney, J. Lubchenco, and J.M. Melillo. 1997. Human domination of the Earth's ecosystems. *Science* 277:494-499.

Walker, B., C.S. Holling, S.R. Carpenter, and A. Kinzig. 2004. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. *Ecology and Society* 9(2): 5. <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss2/art5>

Waters, T.J. H. Lionata, T. Prasetyo Wibowo, R. Jones, S. Theuerkauf, S. Usman, I. Amin, and M. Ilman. 2019. Coastal conservation and sustainable livelihoods through seaweed aquaculture in Indonesia: A guide for buyers, conservation practitioners, and farmers, Version 1. The Nature Conservancy. Arlington VA, USA and Jakarta, Indonesia. 47 pp.

Waycott, M. and 13 others. 2009. Accelerating loss of seagrasses across the globe threatens coastal ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

106:12377–12381.

Weins, J.A. and R.J. Hobbs. 2015. Integrating conservation and restoration in a changing world. *Bioscience* 65:302-312.

Williams, J.W., K.D. Burke, M.S. Crossley, D.A. Grant, and V.C. Radeloff. 2019. Land-use and climatic causes of environmental novelty since 1890. *Ecological Applications* 29, e10955.

Wohl, E. S.N. Lane, and A.C. Wilcox. 2015. The science and practice of river restoration. *Water Resources Research* 51:5974-5997.

Wright, T., J. Tomlinson, T. Schueler, K. Capiella, A. Kitchell, and D. Hirschman. 2006. Direct and indirect impacts of urbanization on wetland quality. *Wetlands and Watersheds Article #1*. Center for Watershed Protection (Ellicott City, Maryland). 81 pp.

Zedler, J.B., J.M. Doherty, and N.A. Miller. 2012. Shifting restoration policy to address landscape change, novel ecosystems, and monitoring. *Ecology and Society* 17:36.

Zedler, J.B. and S. Kercher. 2005. Wetland resources: Status, trends, ecosystem services, and restorability. *Annual Review Environmental Resources*. 30:39-74.