EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

January 14, 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

FROM: NANCY H. SUTLEY
Chair

SUBJECT: Appropriate Use of Mitigation and Monitoring and Clarifying the Appropriate Use of Mitigated Findings of No Significant Impact

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) is issuing this guidance for Federal departments and agencies on establishing, implementing, and monitoring mitigation commitments identified and analyzed in Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Statements, and adopted in the final decision documents. This guidance also clarifies the appropriate use of mitigated "Findings of No Significant Impact" under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This guidance is issued in accordance with NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq., and the CEQ Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (CEQ Regulations), 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508.[1] The guidance explains the requirements of NEPA and the CEQ Regulations, describes CEQ policies, and recommends procedures for agencies to use to help them comply with the requirements of NEPA and the CEQ Regulations when they establish mitigation planning and implementation procedures.[2]

---

[1] The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (CEQ Regulations) are available on www.nepa.gov at ceq.hss.doe.gov/ceq_regulations/regulations.html.

[2] CEQ is issuing this guidance as an exercise of its duties and functions under section 204 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4344, and Executive Order No. 11,514, 35 Fed. Reg. 4,247 (Mar. 5, 1970), as amended by Executive Order No. 11,991, 42 Fed. Reg. 26,927 (May 24, 1977). This guidance is not a rule or regulation, and the recommendations it contains may not apply to a particular situation based upon the individual facts and circumstances. This guidance does not change or substitute for any law, regulation, or other legally binding requirement and is not legally enforceable. The use of language such as "recommend," "may," "should," and "can" is intended to describe CEQ policies and recommendations. The use of mandatory terminology such as "must" and "required" is intended to describe controlling requirements under the terms of NEPA and the CEQ Regulations, but this document does not independently establish legally binding requirements.

NEPA was enacted to promote efforts that will prevent or eliminate damage to the human environment.[3] Mitigation measures can help to accomplish this goal in several ways. Many Federal agencies and applicants include mitigation measures as integral components of a proposed project's design. Agencies also consider mitigation measures as alternatives when developing Environmental Assessments (EA) and Environmental Impact Statements (EIS). In addition, agencies have increasingly considered mitigation measures in EAs to avoid or lessen potentially significant environmental effects of proposed actions that would otherwise need to be analyzed in an EIS.[4] This use of mitigation may allow the agency to comply with NEPA's procedural requirements by issuing an EA and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), or "mitigated FONSI," based on the agency's commitment to ensure the mitigation that supports the FONSI is performed, thereby avoiding the need to prepare an EIS.

This guidance addresses mitigation that an agency has committed to implement as part of a project design and mitigation commitments informed by the NEPA review process. As discussed in detail in Section I, below, agencies may commit to mitigation measures considered as alternatives in an EA or EIS so as to achieve an environmentally preferable outcome. Agencies may also commit to mitigation measures to support a mitigated FONSI, so as to complete their review of potentially significant environmental impacts without preparing an EIS. When agencies do not document and, in important cases, monitor mitigation commitments to determine if the mitigation was implemented or effective, the use of mitigation may fail to advance NEPA's purpose of ensuring informed and transparent environmental decisionmaking. Failure to document and monitor mitigation may also undermine the integrity of the NEPA review. These concerns and the need for guidance on this subject have long been recognized.[5] While

---

[3] 42 U.S.C. § 4321 (stating that the purposes of NEPA include promoting efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment).

[4] This trend was noted in CEQ's Twenty-Fifth Anniversary report on the effectiveness of NEPA implementation. *See* CEQ, "NEPA: A Study of its Effectiveness After Twenty-Five Years" 20 (1997), *available at* ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/nepa25fn.pdf.

[5] *See, e.g.*, CEQ, 1987-1988 Annual Report, *available at* www.slideshare.net/whitehouse/august-1987-1988-the-eighteenth-annual-report-of-the-council-on-environmental-quality (stating that CEQ would issue guidance on the propriety of an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) rather than requiring an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) when the environmental effects of a proposal are significant but mitigation reduces those impacts to less than significant levels). In 2002, CEQ convened a Task Force on Modernizing NEPA Implementation, which recommended that CEQ issue guidance clarifying the requirements for public involvement, alternatives, and mitigation for actions that warrant longer EAs including those with mitigated FONSIs. CEQ NEPA Task Force, "Modernizing NEPA Implementation" 75 (2003), *available at* ceq.hss.doe.gov/ntf/report/totaldoc.html. NEPA experts and public stakeholders have expressed broad support for this recommendation, calling for consideration of monitoring and public involvement in the use of mitigated FONSIs. CEQ, "The Public and Experts'

this guidance is designed to address these concerns, CEQ also acknowledges that NEPA itself does not create a general substantive duty on Federal agencies to mitigate adverse environmental effects.[6]

Accordingly, in conjunction with the 40th Anniversary of NEPA, CEQ announced that it would issue this guidance to clarify the appropriateness of mitigated FONSIs and the importance of monitoring environmental mitigation commitments.[7] This new guidance affirms CEQ's support for the appropriate use of mitigated FONSIs, and accordingly amends and supplements previously issued guidance.[8] This guidance is intended to enhance the integrity and credibility of the NEPA process and the information upon which it relies.

CEQ provides several broad recommendations in Section II, below, to help improve agency consideration of mitigation in EISs and EAs. Agencies should not commit to mitigation measures considered in an EIS or EA absent the authority or expectation of resources to ensure that the mitigation is performed. In the decision documents concluding their environmental reviews, agencies should clearly identify any mitigation measures adopted as agency commitments or otherwise relied upon (to the extent consistent with agency authority or other legal authority), so as to ensure the integrity of the NEPA process and allow for greater transparency.

Review of the National Environmental Policy Act Task Force Report 'Modernizing NEPA Implementation'" 7 (2004), *available at* ceq.hss.doe.gov/ntf/CEQ_Draft_Final_Roundtable_Report.pdf; *see also* CEQ, "Rocky Mountain Roundtable Report" 8 (2004), *available at* ceq.hss.doe.gov/ntf/RockyMtnRoundTableReport.pdf (noting that participants in a regional roundtable on NEPA modernization identified "developing a means to enforce agency commitments to monitoring and mitigation" as one of the top five aspects of NEPA implementation needing immediate attention); "Eastern Round Table Report" 4 (2003), *available at* ceq.hss.doe.gov/ntf/EasternRoundTableReport.pdf (reporting that, according to several panelists at a regional roundtable, "parties responsible for monitoring the effects of . . . mitigation measures are rarely identified or easily held accountable," and that a lack of monitoring impedes agencies' ability to address the cumulative effects of EA actions).

[6] *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 352 (1989).

[7] CEQ, "New Proposed NEPA Guidance and Steps to Modernize and Reinvigorate NEPA" (Feb. 18, 2010), *available at* www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ceq/initiatives/nepa.

[8] This previous guidance is found in CEQ, "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 Fed. Reg. 18,026 (Mar. 23, 1981), *available at* ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/40/40P1.htm (suggesting that the existence of mitigation measures developed during the scoping or EA stages "does not obviate the need for an EIS").

Section III emphasizes that agencies should establish implementation plans based on the importance of the project and its projected effects. Agencies should create new, or strengthen existing, monitoring to ensure that mitigation commitments are implemented. Agencies should also use effectiveness monitoring to learn if the mitigation is providing the benefits predicted. Importantly, agencies should encourage public participation and accountability through proactive disclosure of, and provision of access to, agencies' mitigation commitments as well as mitigation monitoring reports and related documents.

Although the recommendations in this guidance are broad in nature, agencies should establish, in their NEPA implementing procedures and/or guidance, specific procedures that create systematic accountability and the mechanisms to accomplish these goals.[9] This guidance is intended to assist agencies with the development and review of their NEPA procedures, by specifically recommending:

- How to ensure that mitigation commitments are implemented;
- How to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation commitments;
- How to remedy failed mitigation; and
- How to involve the public in mitigation planning.

Finally, to assist agencies in the development of their NEPA implementing procedures, an overview of relevant portions of the Department of the Army NEPA regulations is appended to this guidance as an example for agencies to consider when incorporating the recommendations of this guidance as requirements in their NEPA programs and procedures.[10]

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF MITIGATION UNDER NEPA

Mitigation is an important mechanism Federal agencies can use to minimize the potential adverse environmental impacts associated with their actions. As described in the CEQ Regulations, agencies can use mitigation to reduce environmental impacts in several ways. Mitigation includes:

- Avoiding an impact by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- Minimizing an impact by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation;
- Rectifying an impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
- Reducing or eliminating an impact over time, through preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and

---

[9] 40 CFR § 1507.3 (requiring agencies to issue, and continually review, policies and procedures to implement NEPA in conformity with NEPA and CEQ Regulations).

[10] *See id.*; *see also id.* § 1507.2 (requiring agencies to have personnel and other resources available to implement NEPA reviews and meet their NEPA responsibilities).

- Compensating for an impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.[11]

Federal agencies typically develop mitigation as a component of a proposed action, or as a measure considered in the course of the NEPA review conducted to support agency decisionmaking processes, or both. In developing mitigation, agencies necessarily and appropriately rely upon the expertise and experience of their professional staff to assess mitigation needs, develop mitigation plans, and oversee mitigation implementation. Agencies may also rely on outside resources and experts for information about the ecosystem functions and values to be protected or restored by mitigation, to ensure that mitigation has the desired effects and to develop appropriate monitoring strategies. Any outside parties consulted should be neutral parties without a financial interest in implementing the mitigation and monitoring plans, and should have expert knowledge, training, and experience relevant to the resources potentially affected by the actions and—if possible—the potential effects from similar actions.[12] Further, when agencies delegate responsibility for preparing NEPA analyses and documentation, or when other entities (such as applicants) assume such responsibility, CEQ recommends that any experts employed to develop mitigation and monitoring should have the kind of expert knowledge, training, and experience described above.

The sections below clarify practices Federal agencies should use when they employ mitigation in three different contexts: as components of project design; as mitigation alternatives considered in an EA or an EIS and adopted in related decision documents; and as measures identified and committed to in an EA as necessary to support a mitigated FONSI. CEQ encourages agencies to commit to mitigation to achieve environmentally preferred outcomes, particularly when addressing unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. Agencies should not commit to mitigation, however, unless they have sufficient legal authorities and expect there will be necessary resources available to perform or ensure the performance of the mitigation. The agency's own underlying authority may provide the basis for its commitment to implement and monitor the mitigation. Alternatively, the authority for the mitigation may derive from legal requirements that are enforced by other Federal, state, or local government entities (e.g., air or water permits administered by local or state agencies).

A. Mitigation Incorporated into Project Design

Many Federal agencies rely on mitigation to reduce adverse environmental impacts as part of the planning process for a project, incorporating mitigation as integral components of a proposed project design before making a determination about the

---

[11] *Id.* § 1508.20 (defining mitigation to include these activities).

[12] *See id.* § 1506.5 (providing that agencies are responsible for the accuracy of environmental information submitted by applicants for use in EISs and EAs, and requiring contractors selected to prepare EISs to execute disclosure statement specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project).

significance of the project's environmental impacts.[13] Such mitigation can lead to an environmentally preferred outcome and in some cases reduce the projected impacts of agency actions to below a threshold of significance. An example of mitigation measures that are typically included as part of the proposed action are agency standardized best management practices such as those developed to prevent storm water runoff or fugitive dust emissions at a construction site.

Mitigation measures included in the project design are integral components of the proposed action, are implemented with the proposed action, and therefore should be clearly described as part of the proposed action that the agency will perform or require to be performed. Consequently, the agency can address mitigation early in the decisionmaking process and potentially conduct a less extensive level of NEPA review.

B. Mitigation Alternatives Considered in Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements

Agencies are required, under NEPA, to study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives when preparing EAs and EISs.[14] The CEQ Regulations specifically identify procedures agencies must follow when developing and considering mitigation alternatives when preparing an EIS. When an agency prepares an EIS, it must include mitigation measures (not already included in the proposed action or alternatives) among the alternatives compared in the EIS.[15] Each EIS must contain a section analyzing the environmental consequences of the proposed action and its alternatives, including "[m]eans to mitigate adverse environmental impacts."[16]

When a Federal agency identifies a mitigation alternative in an EA or an EIS, it may commit to implement that mitigation to achieve an environmentally-preferable outcome. Agencies should not commit to mitigation measures considered and analyzed in an EIS or EA if there are insufficient legal authorities, or it is not reasonable to foresee the availability of sufficient resources, to perform or ensure the performance of the mitigation. Furthermore, the decision document following the EA should—and a Record of Decision (ROD) must—identify those mitigation measures that the agency is adopting

---

[13] CEQ NEPA Task Force, "Modernizing NEPA Implementation" at 69.

[14] 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C) (mandating that agencies' detailed statements must include alternatives to the proposed action); *id.* § 4332(E) (requiring agencies to study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources).

[15] 40 CFR § 1502.14(f) (listing mitigation measures as one of the required components of the alternatives included in an EIS); *id.* § 1508.25(b)(3) (defining the "scope" of an EIS to include mitigation measures).

[16] *Id.* § 1502.16(h).

and committing to implement, including any monitoring and enforcement program applicable to such mitigation commitments.[17]

C. Mitigation Commitments Analyzed in Environmental Assessments to Support a Mitigated FONSI

When preparing an EA, many agencies develop and consider committing to mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that would otherwise require full review in an EIS. CEQ recognizes the appropriateness, value, and efficacy of providing for mitigation to reduce the significance of environmental impacts. Consequently, when such mitigation measures are available and an agency commits to perform or ensure the performance of them, then these mitigation commitments can be used to support a FONSI, allowing the agency to conclude the NEPA process and proceed with its action without preparing an EIS.[18] An agency should not commit to mitigation measures necessary for a mitigated FONSI if there are insufficient legal authorities, or it is not reasonable to foresee the availability of sufficient resources, to perform or ensure the performance of the mitigation.[19]

Mitigation commitments needed to lower the level of impacts so that they are not significant should be clearly described in the mitigated FONSI document and in any other relevant decision documents related to the proposed action. Agencies must provide for appropriate public involvement during the development of the EA and FONSI.[20]

---

[17] *Id.* § 1505.2(c) (providing that a record of decision must state whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not; and providing that a monitoring and enforcement program must be adopted and summarized where applicable for any mitigation).

[18] This guidance approves of the use of the "mitigated FONSI" when the NEPA process results in *enforceable* mitigation measures. It thereby amends and supplements previously issued CEQ guidance that suggested that the existence of mitigation measures developed during the scoping or EA stages "does not obviate the need for an EIS." *See* CEQ, "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 Fed. Reg. 18,026 (Mar. 23, 1981), *available at* ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/40/40P1.htm.

[19] When agencies consider and decide on an alternative outside their jurisdiction (as discussed in 40 CFR § 1502.14(c)), they should identify the authority for the mitigation and consider the consequences of it not being implemented.

[20] 40 CFR § 1501.4(b) (requiring agencies to involve environmental agencies, applicants, and the public, to the extent practicable); *id.* § 1501.4(e)(1) (requiring agencies to make FONSIs available to the affected public as specified in § 1506.6); *id.* § 1501.4(e)(2) (requiring agencies to make FONSIs available for public review for thirty days before making any final determination on whether to prepare an EIS or proceed with an action when the proposed action is, or is closely similar to, one which normally requires the

Furthermore, in addition to those situations where a 30-day public review of the FONSI is required,[21] agencies should make the EA and FONSI available to the public (e.g., by posting them on an agency website). Providing the public with clear information about agencies' mitigation commitments helps ensure the value and integrity of the NEPA process.

II. ENSURING THAT MITIGATION COMMITMENTS ARE IMPLEMENTED

Federal agencies should take steps to ensure that mitigation commitments are actually implemented. Consistent with their authority, agencies should establish internal processes to ensure that mitigation commitments made on the basis of any NEPA analysis are carefully documented and that relevant funding, permitting, or other agency approvals and decisions are made conditional on performance of mitigation commitments.

Agency NEPA implementing procedures should require clear documentation of mitigation commitments considered in EAs and EISs prepared during the NEPA process and adopted in their decision documents. Agencies should ensure that the expertise and professional judgment applied in determining the appropriate mitigation commitments are described in the EA or EIS, and that the NEPA analysis considers when and how those mitigation commitments will be implemented.

Agencies should clearly identify commitments to mitigation measures designed to achieve environmentally preferable outcomes in their decision documents. They should also identify mitigation commitments necessary to reduce impacts, where appropriate, to a level necessary for a mitigated FONSI. In both cases, mitigation commitments should be carefully specified in terms of measurable performance standards or expected results, so as to establish clear performance expectations.[22] The agency should also specify the

---

preparation of an EIS under agency NEPA implementing procedures, or when the nature of the proposed action is one without precedent); *id.* § 1506.6 (requiring agencies to make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures).

[21] *Id.* § 1501.4(e)(2).

[22] In 2001, the Committee on Mitigating Wetland Losses, through the National Research Council (NRC), conducted a nationwide study evaluating compensatory mitigation, focusing on whether the process is achieving the overall goal of "restoring and maintaining the quality of the nation's waters." NRC Committee on Mitigating Wetland Losses, "Compensating for Wetland Losses Under the Clean Water Act" 2 (2001). The study's recommendations were incorporated into the 2008 Final Compensatory Mitigation Rule promulgated jointly by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *See* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers & U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources," 73 Fed. Reg. 19,594 (Apr. 10, 2008).

timeframe for the agency action and the mitigation measures in its decision documents, to ensure that the intended start date and duration of the mitigation commitment is clear. When an agency funds, permits, or otherwise approves actions, it should also exercise its available authorities to ensure implementation of any mitigation commitments by including appropriate conditions on the relevant grants, permits, or approvals.

CEQ views funding for implementation of mitigation commitments as critical to ensuring informed decisionmaking. For mitigation commitments that agencies will implement directly, CEQ recognizes that it may not be possible to identify funds from future budgets; however, a commitment to seek funding is considered essential and if it is reasonably foreseeable that funding for implementation of mitigation may be unavailable at any time during the life of the project, the agency should disclose in the EA or EIS the possible lack of funding and assess the resultant environmental effects. If the agency has disclosed and assessed the lack of funding, then unless the mitigation is essential to a mitigated FONSI or necessary to comply with another legal requirement, the action could proceed. If the agency committing to implementing mitigation has not disclosed and assessed the lack of funding, and the necessary funding later becomes unavailable, then the agency should not move forward with the proposed action until funding becomes available or the lack of funding is appropriately assessed (*see* Section III, below).

A. Establishing a Mitigation Monitoring Program

Federal agencies must consider reasonably foreseeable future impacts and conditions in a constantly evolving environment. Decisionmakers will be better able to adapt to changing circumstances by creating a sound mitigation implementation plan and through ongoing monitoring of environmental impacts and their mitigation. Monitoring can improve the quality of overall agency decisionmaking by providing feedback on the effectiveness of mitigation techniques. A comprehensive approach to mitigation planning, implementation, and monitoring will therefore help agencies realize opportunities for reducing environmental impacts through mitigation, advancing the integrity of the entire NEPA process. These approaches also serve NEPA's goals of ensuring transparency and openness by making relevant and useful environmental information available to decisionmakers and the public.[23]

Adaptive management can help an agency take corrective action if mitigation commitments originally made in NEPA and decision documents fail to achieve projected environmental outcomes and there is remaining federal action. Agencies can, in their NEPA reviews, establish and analyze mitigation measures that are projected to result in the desired environmental outcomes, and can then identify those mitigation principles or measures that it would apply in the event the initial mitigation commitments are not implemented or effective. Such adaptive management techniques can be advantageous to both the environment and the agency's project goals.[24] Agencies can also, short of

[23] 40 CFR § 1500.1(b).

[24] *See* CEQ NEPA Task Force, "Modernizing NEPA Implementation" at 44.

adaptive management, analyze specific mitigation alternatives that could take the place of mitigation commitments in the event the commitment is not implemented or effective.

Monitoring is fundamental for ensuring the implementation and effectiveness of mitigation commitments, meeting legal and permitting requirements, and identifying trends and possible means for improvement. Under NEPA, a Federal agency has a continuing duty to ensure that new information about the environmental impact of its proposed actions is taken into account, and that the NEPA review is supplemented when significant new circumstances or information arise that are relevant to environmental concerns and bear on the proposed action or its impacts.[25] For agency decisions based on an EIS, the CEQ Regulations explicitly require that "a monitoring and enforcement program shall be adopted . . . where applicable for any mitigation."[26] In addition, the CEQ Regulations state that agencies may "provide for monitoring to assure that their decisions are carried out and should do so in important cases."[27] Accordingly, an agency should also commit to mitigation monitoring in important cases when relying upon an EA and mitigated FONSI. Monitoring is essential in those important cases where the mitigation is necessary to support a FONSI and thus is part of the justification for the agency's determination not to prepare an EIS.

Agencies are expected to apply professional judgment and the rule of reason when identifying those cases that are important and warrant monitoring, and when determining the type and extent of monitoring they will use to check on the progress made in implementing mitigation commitments as well as their effectiveness. In cases that are less important, the agency should exercise its discretion to determine what level of monitoring, if any, is appropriate. The following are examples of factors that agencies should consider to determine importance:

- Legal requirements of statutes, regulations, or permits;
- Human health and safety;
- Protected resources (e.g., parklands, threatened or endangered species, cultural or historic sites) and the proposed action's impacts on them;
- Degree of public interest in the resource or public debate over the effects of the proposed action and any reasonable mitigation alternatives on the resource; and
- Level of intensity of projected impacts.

Once an agency determines that it will provide for monitoring in a particular case, monitoring plans and programs should be described or incorporated by reference in the

---

[25] 40 CFR § 1502.9(c) (requiring supplementation of EISs when there are substantial changes to the proposed action, or significant new information or circumstances arise that are relevant to the environmental effects of the proposed action).

[26] *Id.* § 1505.2(c).

[27] *Id.* § 1505.3.

agency's decision documents.[28] Agencies have discretion, within the scope of their authority, to select an appropriate form and method for monitoring, but they should identify the monitoring area and establish the appropriate monitoring system.[29] The form and method of monitoring can be informed by an agency's past monitoring plans and programs that tracked impacts on similar resources, as well as plans and programs used by other agencies or entities, particularly those with an interest in the resource being monitored. For mitigation commitments that warrant rigorous oversight, an Environmental Management System (EMS), or other data or management system could serve as a useful way to integrate monitoring efforts effectively.[30] Other possible monitoring methods include agency-specific environmental monitoring, compliance assessment, and auditing systems. For activities involving third parties (e.g., permittees or grantees), it may be appropriate to require the third party to perform the monitoring as long as a clear accountability and oversight framework is established. The monitoring program should be implemented together with a review process and a system for reporting results.

Regardless of the method chosen, agencies should ensure that the monitoring program tracks whether mitigation commitments are being performed as described in the NEPA and related decision documents (i.e., implementation monitoring), and whether the mitigation effort is producing the expected outcomes and resulting environmental effects (i.e., effectiveness monitoring). Agencies should also ensure that their mitigation monitoring procedures appropriately provide for public involvement. These recommendations are explained in more detail below.

---

[28] The mitigation plan and program should be described to the extent possible based on available and reasonably foreseeable information in cases where the NEPA analysis and documentation are completed prior to final design of a proposed project.

[29] The Department of the Army regulations provide an example of this approach. *See* 32 CFR part 651 App. C. These regulations are summarized in the Appendix to this guidance.

[30] An EMS provides a systematic framework for a Federal agency to monitor and continually improve its environmental performance through audits, evaluations of legal and other requirements, and management reviews. The potential for EMS to support NEPA work is further addressed in CEQ, "Aligning National Environmental Policy Act Processes with Environmental Management Systems" 4 (2007) *available at* ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/nepapubs/Aligning_NEPA_Processes_with_Environmental_Management_Systems_2007.pdf (discussing the use of EMSs to track implementation and monitoring of mitigation). In 2001, the Department of the Army announced that it would implement a recognized environmental management standard, ISO 14001, across Army installations. ISO 14001 represents a standardized system to plan, track, and monitor environmental performance within the agency's operations. To learn more about how EMS implementation has resulted in an effective EMS for monitoring purposes at an Army installation, see the Sustainability website for the Army's Fort Lewis installation, *available at* sustainablefortlewis.army.mil.

B. Monitoring Mitigation Implementation

A successful monitoring program will track the implementation of mitigation commitments to determine whether they are being performed as described in the NEPA documents and related decision documents. The responsibility for developing an implementation monitoring program depends in large part upon who will actually perform the mitigation—the lead Federal agency or cooperating agency; the applicant, grantee, or permit holder; another responsible entity or cooperative non-Federal partner; or a combination of these. The lead agency should ensure that information about responsible parties, mitigation requirements, as well as any appropriate enforcement clauses are included in documents such as authorizations, agreements, permits, financial assistance awards, or contracts.[31] Ultimate monitoring responsibility rests with the lead Federal agency or agencies to assure that monitoring is occurring when needed and that results are being properly considered. The project's lead agency can share monitoring responsibility with joint lead or cooperating agencies or other entities, such as applicants or grantees. The responsibility should be clearly described in the NEPA documents or associated decision documents, or related documents describing and establishing the monitoring requirements or expectations.

C. Monitoring the Effectiveness of Mitigation

Effectiveness monitoring tracks the success of a mitigation effort in achieving expected outcomes and environmental effects. Completing environmental data collection and analyses prior to project implementation provides an understanding of the baseline conditions for each potentially affected resource for reference when determining whether the predicted efficacy of mitigation commitments is being achieved. Agencies can rely on agency staff and outside experts familiar with the predicted environmental impacts to develop the means to monitor mitigation effectiveness, in the same way that they can rely on agency and outside experts to develop and evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation (*see* Section I, above).

When monitoring mitigation, agencies should consider drawing on sources of information available from the agency, from other Federal agencies, and from state, local, and tribal agencies, as well as from non-governmental sources such as local organizations, academic institutions, and non-governmental organizations. Agencies should especially consider working with agencies responsible for overseeing land management and impacts to specific resources. For example, agencies could consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and National Marine Fisheries Services (for information to evaluate potential impacts to threatened and endangered species) and with State Historic Preservation Officers (for information to evaluate potential impacts to historic structures).

[31] Such enforcement clauses, including appropriate penalty clauses, should be developed as allowable under the applicable statutory and regulatory authorities.

D. The Role of the Public

Public involvement is a key procedural requirement of the NEPA review process, and should be fully provided for in the development of mitigation and monitoring procedures.[32] Agencies are also encouraged, as a matter of transparency and accountability, to consider including public involvement components in their mitigation monitoring programs. The agencies' experience and professional judgment are key to determining the appropriate level of public involvement. In addition to advancing accountability and transparency, public involvement may provide insight or perspective for improving mitigation activities and monitoring. The public may also assist with actual monitoring through public-private partnership programs.

Agencies should provide for public access to mitigation monitoring information consistent with NEPA and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).[33] NEPA and the CEQ Regulations incorporate the FOIA by reference to require agencies to provide public access to releasable documents related to EISs, which may include documents regarding mitigation monitoring and enforcement.[34] The CEQ Regulations also require agencies to involve the public in the EA preparation process to the extent practicable and in certain cases to make a FONSI available for public review before making its final determination on whether it will prepare an EIS or proceed with the action.[35] Consequently, agencies should involve the public when preparing EAs and mitigated FONSIs.[36] NEPA further requires all Federal agencies to make information useful for restoring, maintaining, and

---

[32] 40 CFR § 1506.6 (requiring agencies to make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures).

[33] 5 U.S.C. § 552.

[34] 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C) (requiring Federal agencies to make EISs available to the public as provided by the FOIA); 40 CFR § 1506.6(f) (requiring agencies to make EISs, comments received, and any underlying documents available to the public pursuant to the provisions of the FOIA without regard to the exclusion for interagency memoranda where such memoranda transmit comments of Federal agencies on the environmental impact of the proposed action).

[35] 40 CFR § 1501.4(b) (requiring agencies to involve environmental agencies, applicants, and the public, to the extent practicable); *id.* § 1501.4(e)(1) (requiring agencies to make FONSIs available to the affected public as specified in § 1506.6); *id.* § 1501.4(e)(2) (requiring agencies to make a FONSI available for public review for thirty days before making its final determination on whether it will prepare an EIS or proceed with the action when the nature of the proposed action is, or is similar to, an action which normally requires the preparation of an EIS); *id.* § 1506.6 (requiring agencies to make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures).

[36] *Id.* § 1501.4.

enhancing the quality of the environment available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals.[37] This requirement can include information on mitigation and mitigation monitoring.

Beyond these requirements, agencies are encouraged to make proactive, discretionary release of mitigation monitoring reports and other supporting documents, and to make responses to public inquiries regarding mitigation monitoring readily available to the public through online or print media. This recommendation is consistent with the President's Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government directing agencies to take affirmative steps to make information public without waiting for specific requests for information.[38] The Open Government Directive, issued by the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with the President's Memorandum, further directs agencies to use their web sites and information technology capabilities to disseminate, to the maximum extent practicable, useful information under FOIA, so as to promote transparency and accountability.[39]

Agencies should exercise their judgment to ensure that the methods and media used to provide mitigation and monitoring information are commensurate with the importance of the action and the resources at issue, taking into account any risks of harm to affected resources. In some cases, agencies may need to balance competing privacy or confidentiality concerns (e.g., protecting confidential business information or the location of sacred sites) with the benefits of public disclosure.

III. REMEDYING INEFFECTIVE OR NON-IMPLEMENTED MITIGATION

Through careful monitoring, agencies may discover that mitigation commitments have not been implemented, or have not had the environmental results predicted in the NEPA and decision documents. Agencies, having committed to mitigation, should work to remedy such inadequacies. It is an agency's underlying authority or other legal authority that provides the basis for the commitment to implement mitigation and monitor its effectiveness. As discussed in Section I, agencies should not commit to mitigation considered in an EIS or EA unless there are sufficient legal authorities and they expect the resources to be available to perform or ensure the performance of the mitigation. In some cases, as discussed in Section II, agencies may exercise their authority to make

---

[37] 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(G).

[38] Presidential Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies Concerning the Freedom of Information Act, 74 Fed. Reg. 4,683 (Jan. 21, 2009); *accord* DOJ, "Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies Concerning the Freedom of Information Act" (Mar. 19, 2009), *available at* www.usdoj.gov/ag/foia-memo-march2009.pdf.

[39] Office of Mgmt. & Budget, Executive Office of the President, "Open Government Directive" (Dec. 8, 2009), *available at* www.whitehouse.gov/open/documents/open-government-directive.

relevant funding, permitting, or other agency approvals and decisions conditional on the performance of mitigation commitments by third parties. It follows that an agency must rely on its underlying authority and available resources to take remedial steps. Agencies should consider taking remedial steps as long as there remains a pending Federal decision regarding the project or proposed action. Agencies may also exercise their legal authority to enforce conditions placed on funding, grants, permits, or other approvals.

If a mitigation commitment is simply not undertaken or fails to mitigate the environmental effects as predicted, the responsible agency should further consider whether it is necessary to prepare supplemental NEPA analysis and documentation.[40] The agency determination would be based upon its expertise and judgment regarding environmental consequences. Much will depend upon the agency's determination as to what, if any, portions of the Federal action remain and what opportunities remain to address the effects of the mitigation failure. In cases where an EIS or a supplementary EA or EIS is required, the agency must avoid actions that would have adverse environmental impacts and limit its choice of reasonable alternatives during the preparation of an EIS.[41]

In cases where there is no remaining agency action to be taken, and the mitigation has not been fully implemented or has not been as effective as predicted, it may not be appropriate to supplement the original NEPA analysis and documentation. However, it would be appropriate for future NEPA analyses of similar proposed actions and relevant programs to consider past experience and address the potential for environmental consequences as a result of mitigation failure. This would ensure that the assumed environmental baselines reflect true conditions, and that similar mitigation is not relied on in subsequent decisions, at least without more robust provisions for adaptive management or analysis of mitigation alternatives that can be applied in the event of mitigation failure.

IV. CONCLUSION

This guidance is intended to assist Federal agencies with the development of their NEPA procedures, guidance, and regulations; foster the appropriate use of Findings of No Significant Impact; and ensure that mitigation commitments are appropriately and effectively documented, implemented, and monitored. The guidance also provides Federal agencies with recommended actions in circumstances where mitigation is not

---

[40] 40 CFR § 1502.9(c) (requiring an agency to prepare supplements to draft or final EISs if the agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns, or if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts).

[41] *Id.* § 1506.1(a) (providing that until an agency issues a Record of Decision, no action concerning the proposal may be taken that would have an adverse environmental impact or limit the choice of reasonable alternatives).

implemented or fails to have the predicted effect. Questions regarding this guidance should be directed to the CEQ Associate Director for NEPA Oversight.

APPENDIX

Case Study: Existing Agency Mitigation Regulations & Guidance

A number of agencies have already taken actions to improve their use of mitigation and their monitoring of mitigation commitments undertaken as part of their NEPA processes. For example, the Department of the Army has promulgated regulations implementing NEPA for military installations and programs that include a monitoring and implementation component.[42] These NEPA implementing procedures are notable for their comprehensive approach to ensuring that mitigation proposed in the NEPA review process is completed and monitored for effectiveness. These procedures are described in detail below to illustrate one approach agencies can use to meet the goals of this Guidance.

a. *Mitigation Planning*

Consistent with existing CEQ guidelines, the Army's NEPA implementing regulations place significant emphasis on the planning and implementation of mitigation throughout the environmental analysis process. The first step of mitigation planning is to seek to avoid or minimize harm.[43] When the analysis proceeds to an EA or EIS, however, the Army regulation requires that any mitigation measures be "clearly assessed and those selected for implementation will be identified in the [FONSI] or the ROD," and that "[t]he proponent must implement those identified mitigations, because they are commitments made as part of the Army decision."[44] This is notable as this mitigation is a binding commitment documented in the agency NEPA decision. In addition, the adoption of mitigation that reduces environmental impacts below the NEPA significance threshold is similarly binding upon the agency.[45] When the mitigation results in a FONSI in a NEPA analysis, the mitigation is considered legally binding.[46] Because these regulations create a clear obligation for the agency to ensure any proposed mitigation adopted in the environmental review process is performed, there is assurance that mitigation will lead to a reduction of environmental impacts in the implementation stage and include binding mechanisms for enforcement.

Another important mechanism in the Army's regulations to assure effective mitigation results is the requirement to fully fund and implement adopted mitigation. It is acknowledged in the regulations that "unless money is actually budgeted and manpower

---

[42] The Department of the Army promulgated its NEPA implementing procedures as a regulation.

[43] *See* 40 CFR § 1508.2.

[44] 32 CFR § 651.15(b).

[45] *Id.* § 651.35(g)

[46] *Id.* § 651.15(c).

assigned, the mitigation does not exist."[47] As a result, a proposed action cannot proceed until all adopted mitigation is fully resourced or until the lack of funding is addressed in the NEPA analysis.[48] This is an important step in the planning process, as mitigation benefits are unlikely to be realized unless financial and planning resources are committed through the NEPA planning process.

b. *Mitigation Monitoring*

The Army regulations recognize that monitoring is an integral part of any mitigation system.[49] The Army regulations require monitoring plans and implementation programs to be summarized in NEPA documentation, and should consider several important factors. These factors include anticipated changes in environmental conditions or project activities, unexpected outcomes from mitigation, controversy over the selected alternative, potential impacts or adverse effects on federally or state protected resources, and statutory permitting requirements.[50] Consideration of these factors can help prioritize monitoring efforts and anticipate possible challenges.

The Army regulations distinguish between implementation monitoring and effectiveness monitoring. Implementation monitoring ensures that mitigation commitments made in NEPA documentation are implemented. To further this objective, the Army regulations specify that these conditions must be written into any contracts furthering the proposed action. In addition, the agency or unit proposing the action is ultimately responsible for the performance of the mitigation activities.[51] In a helpful appendix to its regulations, the Army outlines guidelines for the creation of an implementation monitoring program to address contract performance, the role of cooperating agencies, and the responsibilities of the lead agency.[52]

The Army's effectiveness monitoring addresses changing conditions inherent in evolving natural systems and the potential for unexpected environmental mitigation outcomes. For this monitoring effort, the Army utilizes its Environmental Management System (EMS) based on the standardized ISO 14001 protocols.[53] The core of this

---

[47] *Id.* § 651.15(d).

[48] *Id.* § 651.15(d).

[49] *Id.* § 651.15(i).

[50] *Id.* §§ 651.15(h)(1)-(4) Appendix C to 32 CFR § 651, 67 Fed. Reg. 15,290, 15,326-28 (Mar. 29, 2002).

[51] *Id.* § 651.15(i)(1).

[52] *See* Appendix C to 32 CFR § 651, 67 Fed. Reg. 15,290, 15,326-28 (Mar. 29, 2002).

[53] *See also* CEQ, "Aligning NEPA Processes with Environmental Management Systems" (2007), *available at*

program is the creation of a clear and accountable system for tracking and reporting both quantitative and qualitative measures of the mitigation efforts. An action-forcing response to mitigation failure is essential to the success of any mitigation program. In the context of a mitigated FONSI, the Army regulations provide that if any "identified mitigation measures do not occur, so that significant adverse environmental effects could be reasonably expected to result, the [agency actor] must publish a [Notice of Intent] and prepare an EIS."[54] This is an essential response measure to changed conditions in the proposed agency action. In addition, the Army regulations address potential failures in the mitigation systems indentified through monitoring. If mitigation is ineffective, the agency entity responsible should re-examine the mitigation and consider a different approach to mitigation. However, if mitigation is required to reduce environmental impacts below significance levels are found to be ineffective, the regulations contemplate the issuance of a Notice of Intent and preparation of an EIS.[55]

The Army regulations also provide guidance for the challenging task of defining parameters for effectiveness monitoring. Guidelines include identifying a source of expertise, using measurable and replicable technical parameters, conducting a baseline study before mitigation is commenced, using a control to isolate mitigation effects, and, importantly, providing timely results to allow the decision-maker to take corrective action if necessary.[56] In addition, the regulations call for the preparation of an environmental monitoring report to determine the accuracy of the mitigation impact predictions made in the NEPA planning process.[57] The report is essential for agency planning and documentation and promotes public engagement in the mitigation process.

c. *Public Engagement*

The Army regulations seek to integrate robust engagement of the interested public in the mitigation monitoring program. The regulations place responsibility on the entity proposing the action to respond to inquiries from the public and other agencies regarding the status of mitigation adopted in the NEPA process.[58] In addition, the regulations find that "concerned citizens are essential to the credibility of [the] review" of mitigation

---

ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/nepapubs/Aligning_NEPA_Processes_with_Environmental_Management_Systems_2007.pdf.

[54] 32 CFR § 651.15(c).

[55] *See id.* § 651.35(g) (describing the implementation steps, including public availability and implementation tracking, that must be taken when a FONSI requires mitigation); *id.* § 651.15(k).

[56] *See* subsections (g)(1)-(5) of Appendix C to 32 CFR § 651, 67 Fed. Reg. at 15,327.

[57] 32 CFR § 651.15(l).

[58] *Id.* § 651.15(b).

effectiveness.[59] The Army specifies that outreach with the interested public regarding mitigation efforts is to be coordinated by the installation's Environmental Office.[60] These regulations bring the public a step closer to the process by designating an agency source responsible for enabling public participation, and by acknowledging the important role the public can play to ensure the integrity and tracking of the mitigation process. The success of agency mitigation efforts will be bolstered by public access to timely information on NEPA mitigation monitoring.

# # #

[59] *Id.* § 651.15(k).

[60] 32 CFR § 651.15(j).