RESOLUTION of the
WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL
regarding
CLEAN WATER ACT JURISDICTION
Rohnert Park, California
June 29, 2017

WHEREAS, the Clean Water Act (CWA) is built upon the principle of cooperative federalism in which Congress intended the states, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to implement the CWA as partners, delegating co-regulator authority to the states;

WHEREAS, the CWA’s cooperative federalism framework has resulted in significant water quality improvements since the law’s enactment in 1972, and western states have made great strides in protecting water quality and coordinating water quality and water quantity decisions; and

WHEREAS, states are best positioned to manage the water within their borders because of their on-the-ground knowledge of the unique aspects of their hydrology, geology, and legal frameworks; and

WHEREAS, states have authority pursuant to their “waters of the state” jurisdiction to protect the quality of waters within their borders and such jurisdiction generally extends beyond the limits of federal jurisdiction under the CWA; and

WHEREAS, Section 101(b) supports the states’ critical role in protecting water quality by stating: “It is the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution;” and

WHEREAS, Section 101(g) of the CWA further provides that the primary and exclusive authority of each state to “allocate quantities of water within its jurisdiction shall not be superseded, abrogated, or otherwise impaired by this Act;” and

WHEREAS, current federal regulations, guidance, and programs pertaining to the CWA do not always recognize the specific conditions and needs in the West, where water can be scarce and a variety of unique waterbodies exist, including but not limited to small ephemeral washes, effluent-dependent streams, prairie potholes, playa lakes, and numerous man-made reservoirs, waterways, and water conveyance structures; and

WHEREAS, past federal efforts to clarify the extent of CWA jurisdiction following the U.S. Supreme Court’s decisions in SWANCC v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 531 U.S. 159 (2001), and Rapanos v. United States, 547 U.S. 715 (2006), failed to include adequate state consultation in their development, despite repeated requests from the Western States Water Council to do so; and

WHEREAS, the considerable differences in hydrology, geology, and legal frameworks that exist among the western states mean that any effort to clarify CWA jurisdiction will invariably impact each state differently, thus underscoring the need to thoroughly involve states in developing regulatory language that clearly respects and avoids conflict with state authority over the regulation and allocation of waters within their respective borders; and

WHEREAS, any efforts to redefine or clarify CWA jurisdiction have, on their face, numerous federalism implications that have the potential to significantly impact states and alter the distribution of power and responsibilities among the states and the federal government, and therefore trigger federalism consultation with the states under Executive Order 13132; and
WHEREAS, as co-regulators, states are separate and apart from the general public, and deserve a unique audience with the federal government in the development and implementation of any federal effort to clarify or redefine CWA jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, information-sharing does not equate to meaningful consultation, and the uncertainty and differences of opinion that exist regarding CWA jurisdiction requires EPA and the Corps to develop and implement federal CWA jurisdiction efforts in authentic partnership with the states;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Congress and the Administration should ensure that any federal effort to clarify or define CWA jurisdiction:

1. Gives as much weight and deference as possible to state needs, priorities, and concerns.

2. Includes robust and meaningful state participation and consultation in its development and implementation. Such consultation should take place as early as possible and before the publication of any proposal for public comment, when irreversible momentum may preclude effective state participation and the consideration of alternate ways of meeting federal objectives. Federal CWA jurisdiction efforts should also acknowledge their inherent federalism implications and comply with Executive Order 13132’s state consultation criteria.

3. Gives full force and effect to, and does not diminish or in any way detract from, the intent and purpose of CWA Sections 101(b) and 101(g).

4. Recognizes that Justice Kennedy’s “significant nexus” test in Rapanos requires a connection between waters that is more than speculative or insubstantial to establish jurisdiction. Federal CWA jurisdiction efforts should also quantify “significance” to ensure that the term’s usage does not extend jurisdiction to waters with a de minimis connection to jurisdictional waters.

5. Complies with the limits Congress and the U.S. Supreme Court have placed on CWA jurisdiction, while providing clear and recognizable limits to the extent of CWA jurisdiction, consistent with the plurality opinion authored by Justice Scalia in Rapanos.

6. Specifically excludes waters and features generally considered to be outside the scope of CWA jurisdiction, including:

   (a) Groundwater;
   (b) Farm ponds, stock ponds, irrigation ditches, and the maintenance of drainage ditches, as currently excluded under the CWA’s agricultural exemption;
   (c) Man-made dugouts and ponds used for stockwatering or irrigation in upland areas that are not connected to surface waters;
   (d) Dip ponds that are excavated on a temporary, emergency basis to combat wildfires and address dust abatement; and
   (e) Prairie potholes and playa lakes.

7. Acknowledges that states have authority pursuant to their “waters of the state” jurisdiction to protect excluded waters, and that excluding waters from federal jurisdiction does not mean that they will be exempt from regulation and protection.