

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Appendix D-1. Summary of Fully Supporting, Threatened, and Impaired Waters in Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Full Support - Evaluated	Full Support - Monitored	Full Support - Not Specified	Full Support - Total	Threatened - Evaluated	Threatened - Monitored	Threatened - Not Specified	Threatened - Total	Impaired - Evaluated	Impaired - Monitored	Impaired - Not Specified
Alabama				0				0			
Alaska				0				0			
Arizona				0				0			
Arkansas				0				0			
California	14,946	0	0	14,946	708	3	0	711	112,809	9,742	0
Colorado				0				0			
Connecticut				0				0			
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>				0				0			
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Delaware				0				0			
District of Columbia				0				0			
Florida				0				0			
Georgia				0				0			
Guam				0				0			
Hawaii				0				0			
Idaho				0				0			
Illinois				0				0			
Indiana				0				0			
Iowa	1,900	0	0	1,900	12,539	0	0	12,539	18,782	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,197	10,197	0	0	25,410
Kentucky				0			973,168	973,168			
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>				0				0			
Louisiana	4,480	0	0	4,480	0	0	0	0	199,040	464,000	0
Maine				0				0			
<i>Manzanita Band</i>				0				0			
Maryland				0				0			
Massachusetts				0				0			
Michigan	0	10	0	10				0	0	0	0
Minnesota				0				0			
Mississippi				0				0			
Missouri				0				0			
Montana				0				0			
N Mariana Islands				0				0			
Nebraska				0				0			
Nevada	21,326	0	0	21,326				0	0	0	0
New Hampshire				0				0			
New Jersey				0				0			
New Mexico				0				0			
New York				0				0			
North Carolina			4,706,000	4,706,000				0			2,469,000
North Dakota				0				0			

Appendix D-1. Summary of Fully Supporting, Threatened, and Impaired Waters in Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Impaired - Total	Total Evaluated	Total Monitored	Total Unspecified	Total Assessed	Comment
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	
California	122,551	128,463	9,745	0	138,208	
Colorado	0	0	0	0	0	
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>	2	2	0	0	2	
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	
Illinois	0	0	0	0	0	
Indiana	0	0	0	0	0	
Iowa	18,782	33,221	0	0	33,221	
Kansas	25,410	0	0	35,607	35,607	Entered aquatic life use support since the state did not report on summary
Kentucky	0	0	0	973,168	973,168	
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
Louisiana	663,040	203,520	464,000	0	667,520	
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Manzanita Band</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	
Michigan	0	0	10	0	10	The losses and/or gains of Michigan wetlands are not adequately tracked to provide a credible or even reasonable estimate of their loss or gain.
Minnesota	0	0	0	0	0	
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	
N Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0	
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	Nebraska does not currently have acreage coverages for individual wetlands. Recent monitoring has failed to reveal water quality standard criteria exceedances.
Nevada	0	21,326	0	0	21,326	
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	Not assessed because New Hampshire does not have specific water quality standards for wetlands.
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0	
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	
New York	0	0	0	0	0	
North Carolina	2,469,000	0	0	7,175,000	7,175,000	
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	

Appendix D-1. Summary of Fully Supporting, Threatened, and Impaired Waters in Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Full Support - Evaluated	Full Support - Monitored	Full Support - Not Specified	Full Support - Total	Threatened - Evaluated	Threatened - Monitored	Threatened - Not Specified	Threatened - Total	Impaired - Evaluated	Impaired - Monitored	Impaired - Not Specified
Ohio				0				0			
Oklahoma				0				0			
Oregon				0				0			
Pennsylvania				0				0			
Puerto Rico				0				0			
Rhode Island				0				0			
South Carolina				0				0			
South Dakota				0				0			
Tennessee	732,189	0	0	732,189				0	54,811	0	0
Texas				0				0			
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>				0				0			
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>				0				0			
Utah				0				0			
Vermont				0				0			
Virgin Islands	728	0	0	728	198	0	0	198	0	0	1
Virginia				0				0			
Washington				0				0			
West Virginia				0				0			
Wisconsin				0				0			
Wyoming				0				0			
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>				0				0			
Total	775,569	10	4,706,000	5,481,579	13,445	3	983,365	996,813	385,444	473,742	2,494,411
	8%	0%	48%	56%	0%	0%	10%	10%	4%	5%	25%

Appendix D-1. Summary of Fully Supporting, Threatened, and Impaired Waters in Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Impaired - Total	Total Evaluated	Total Monitored	Total Unspecified	Total Assessed	Comment
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0	
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	0	
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0	
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	
Tennessee	54,811	787,000	0	0	787,000	
Texas	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>	0	0	0	0	0	The assessment of wetlands area on the Torres-Martinez reservation is included in the lakes assessment.
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>	0	0	0	0	0	The wetlands associated with the Coachella Valley Stormwater Channel were included in the rivers and streams assessment.
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	
Virgin Islands	1	926	0	1	927	
Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	0	
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	3,353,596	1,174,458	473,755	8,183,776	9,831,988	
	34%	12%	5%	83%		

Appendix D-2. Leading Pollutants and Stressors Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Sediment/ Siltation	Flow Alterations	Habitat Alterations	Filling and Draining	Nutrients	Low DO	Metals	Exotic Species	Pathogens	Unknown Toxicity	Water Diversions	Noxious Aquatic Plants	Priority Organic Chemicals	Natural
Alabama														
Alaska														
Arizona														
Arkansas														
California	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	
Colorado														
Connecticut														
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>														
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>	X	X	X					X						
Delaware														
District of Columbia														
Florida														
Georgia														
Guam	X	X	X	X							X			X
Hawaii														
Idaho														
Illinois														
Indiana														
Iowa	X	X			X			X				X		
Kansas	X	X			X	X								
Kentucky														
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>														
Louisiana						X	X							
Maine														
<i>Manzanita Band</i>														
Maryland														
Massachusetts														
Michigan														
Minnesota	X		X	X	X		X			X		X		
Mississippi														
Missouri														
Montana														
N Mariana Islands				X										
Nebraska	X		X	X							X			
Nevada														
New Hampshire														
New Jersey														
New Mexico														
New York														
North Carolina														
North Dakota														
Ohio														
Oklahoma														
Oregon														
Pennsylvania														
Puerto Rico														
Rhode Island														

Appendix D-2. Leading Pollutants and Stressors Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Ammonia	Pesticides	Salinity/TS S/Chlorides	Oil and Grease	Weeds	Total Toxics	Comment
Alabama							
Alaska							
Arizona							
Arkansas							
California	X	X	X	X		X	
Colorado							
Connecticut							
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>							
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>					X		
Delaware							
District of Columbia							
Florida							
Georgia							
Guam							
Hawaii							
Idaho							
Illinois							
Indiana							
Iowa							
Kansas							
Kentucky							
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>							
Louisiana							
Maine							
<i>Manzanita Band</i>							
Maryland							
Massachusetts							
Michigan							
Minnesota							
Mississippi							
Missouri							
Montana							
N Mariana Islands							
Nebraska							
Nevada							
New Hampshire							N/A notes all have occurred, or have the potential to do so, but none have been identified as a significant threat to wetlands
New Jersey							
New Mexico							
New York							
North Carolina							
North Dakota							
Ohio							
Oklahoma							
Oregon							
Pennsylvania							
Puerto Rico							
Rhode Island							

Appendix D-2. Leading Pollutants and Stressors Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Sediment/ Siltation	Flow Alterations	Habitat Alterations	Filling and Draining	Nutrients	Low DO	Metals	Exotic Species	Pathogens	Unknown Toxicity	Water Diversions	Noxious Aquatic Plants	Priority Organic Chemicals	Natural
South Carolina														
South Dakota														
Tennessee	X	X	X	X									X	
Texas														
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>														
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>														
Utah														
Vermont														
Virgin Islands	X					X			X					
Virginia														
Washington														
West Virginia														
Wisconsin														
Wyoming														
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>														
Total		9	6	6	6	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	1

X - The state, tribe, or territory reported that the pollutant or stressor is responsible for impairment to assessed wetlands.

Appendix D-2. Leading Pollutants and Stressors Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Ammonia	Pesticides	Salinity/TS S/Chlorides	Oil and Grease	Weeds	Total Toxics	Comment
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas							
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>							
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>							
Utah							
Vermont							
Virgin Islands							
Virginia							
Washington							
West Virginia							
Wisconsin							
Wyoming							
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservatio</i>							
Total	1	1	1	1	1	1	
X - The state, tribe, or territor							

Appendix D-3. Leading Sources Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Agriculture	Hydrologic Modification	Development (General)	Filling and Draining	Urban Runoff	Resource Extraction	Construction	Road Construction	Natural
Alabama									
Alaska									
Arizona									
Arkansas									
California	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Colorado									
Connecticut									
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>									
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>	X		X						
Delaware									
District of Columbia									
Florida									
Georgia									
Guam	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hawaii									
Idaho									
Illinois									
Indiana									
Iowa	X	X							
Kansas	X	X							X
Kentucky									
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>									
Louisiana									
Maine									
<i>Manzanita Band</i>									
Maryland									
Massachusetts									
Michigan									
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Mississippi									
Missouri									
Montana									
N Mariana Islands			X						
Nebraska	X	X	X	X		X		X	
Nevada									
New Hampshire									

Appendix D-3. Leading Sources Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Channelization	Landfills	Municipal Point Sources	Habitat Modifications	Spills	Livestock Grazing	Dredging	Recreation	Silviculture	Public Projects
Alabama										
Alaska										
Arizona										
Arkansas										
California	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	
Colorado										
Connecticut										
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>										
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>			X							X
Delaware										
District of Columbia										
Florida										
Georgia										
Guam	X	X					X	X		X
Hawaii										
Idaho										
Illinois										
Indiana										
Iowa				X						
Kansas										
Kentucky										
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>										
Louisiana										
Maine										
<i>Manzanita Band</i>										
Maryland										
Massachusetts										
Michigan										
Minnesota		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Mississippi										
Missouri										
Montana										
N Mariana Islands										
Nebraska										
Nevada										
New Hampshire										

Appendix D-3. Leading Sources Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Commercial Development	Ground Water Loadings	Land Disposal	Industrial Point Sources	Comment
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California		X	X	X	
Colorado					
Connecticut					
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>					
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>					An encroaching parking and garden are responsible for wetlands integrity degradation.
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Guam	X				
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
Iowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>					
Louisiana					Louisiana reports that atmospheric deposition and unknown sources impact wetlands.
Maine					
<i>Manzanita Band</i>					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota	X				
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
N Mariana Islands					
Nebraska					Many of the sources identified are mitigated.
Nevada					
New Hampshire					NH notes most of these occur to a limited degree, but none have been identified as a significant threat to wetlands integrity.

Appendix D-3. Leading Sources Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Agriculture	Hydrologic Modification	Development (General)	Filling and Draining	Urban Runoff	Resource Extraction	Construction	Road Construction	Natural
New Jersey									
New Mexico									
New York									
North Carolina									
North Dakota									
Ohio									
Oklahoma									
Oregon									
Pennsylvania									
Puerto Rico									
Rhode Island									
South Carolina									
South Dakota									
Tennessee	X	X	X	X			X	X	
Texas									
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>									
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>									
Utah									
Vermont									
Virgin Islands					X				
Virginia									
Washington									
West Virginia									
Wisconsin									
Wyoming									
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>									
Total	8	7	6	5	4	4	4	4	3
X - The state, tribe, or territory reported that the source is responsible for impairment to assessed wetlands.									

Appendix D-3. Leading Sources Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Channelization	Landfills	Municipal Point Sources	Habitat Modifications	Spills	Livestock Grazing	Dredging	Recreation	Silviculture	Public Projects
New Jersey										
New Mexico										
New York										
North Carolina										
North Dakota										
Ohio										
Oklahoma										
Oregon										
Pennsylvania										
Puerto Rico										
Rhode Island										
South Carolina										
South Dakota										
Tennessee	X									
Texas										
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>										
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>										
Utah										
Vermont										
Virgin Islands			X		X					
Virginia										
Washington										
West Virginia										
Wisconsin										
Wyoming										
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>										
Total	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
X - The state, tribe, or territory										

Appendix D-3. Leading Sources Impairing Assessed Wetlands

Jurisdiction	Commercial Development	Ground Water Loadings	Land Disposal	Industrial Point Sources	Comment
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Puerto Rico					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee		X			
Texas					
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>					
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virgin Islands					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>					
Total	2	2	1	1	
X - The state, tribe, or territory					

Appendix D-4. Leading Sources of Recent Wetlands Losses

Jurisdiction	Development and Urban Growth	Agriculture	Road/Highway/Bridge Construction	Filling and Draining	Construction (General)	Industrial Development	Hydrologic Modifications	Channelization	Commercial Development	Dredging	Resource Extraction	Utilities	Impoundments
Alabama													
Alaska													
Arizona													
Arkansas													
California													
Colorado													
Connecticut													
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>													
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>	X												
Delaware													
District of Columbia													
Florida													
Georgia													
Guam	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			
Hawaii													
Idaho													
Illinois													
Indiana													
Iowa	X	X	X	X		X		X	X			X	
Kansas	X	X	X		X		X						
Kentucky													
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>													
Louisiana													
Maine													
Manzanita Band													
Maryland													
Massachusetts													
Michigan													
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mississippi													
Missouri													
Montana													
N Mariana Islands				X									
Nebraska													
Nevada													
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
New Jersey													
New Mexico													
New York													
North Carolina													
North Dakota													
Ohio													
Oklahoma													
Oregon													
Pennsylvania													
Puerto Rico													
Rhode Island													
South Carolina													
South Dakota													
Tennessee	X	X	X	X	X								
Texas													
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>													
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>													
Utah													
Vermont	X	X	X			X							

Appendix D-4. Leading Sources of Recent Wetlands Losses

Jurisdiction	Development and Urban Growth	Agriculture	Road/Highway/Bridge Construction	Filling and Draining	Silviculture	Recreation	Public Projects	Construction of Wharves, Piers, Bulkheads	Marinas	Land Disposal	Landfills	Mosquito Control	Peat Mining
Alabama													
Alaska													
Arizona													
Arkansas													
California													
Colorado													
Connecticut													
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>													
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>	X												
Delaware													
District of Columbia													
Florida													
Georgia													
Guam	X	X	X	X			X						
Hawaii													
Idaho													
Illinois													
Indiana													
Iowa	X	X	X	X		X	X						
Kansas	X	X	X										
Kentucky													
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>													
Louisiana													
Maine													
Manzanita Band													
Maryland													
Massachusetts													
Michigan													
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X
Mississippi													
Missouri													
Montana													
N Mariana Islands				X									
Nebraska													
Nevada													
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X	X			X					
New Jersey													
New Mexico													
New York													
North Carolina													
North Dakota													
Ohio													
Oklahoma													
Oregon													
Pennsylvania													
Puerto Rico													
Rhode Island													
South Carolina													
South Dakota													
Tennessee	X	X	X	X									
Texas													
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>													
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>													
Utah													
Vermont	X	X	X										

Appendix D-4. Leading Sources of Recent Wetlands Losses

Jurisdiction	Development and Urban Growth	Agriculture	Road/Highway/Bridge Construction	Filling and Draining	Comment
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>					
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>	X				
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Guam	X	X	X	X	
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
Iowa	X	X	X	X	
Kansas	X	X	X		
Kentucky					
<i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Manzanita Band					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
N Mariana Islands				X	
Nebraska					
Nevada					NH notes sources are regulated by state law and have limited net impact on wetlands.
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X	
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Puerto Rico					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee	X	X	X	X	
Texas					
<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i>					
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>					
Utah					
Vermont	X	X	X		

Appendix D-4. Leading Sources of Recent Wetlands Losses

Jurisdiction	Development and Urban Growth	Agriculture	Road/Highway/Bridge Construction	Filling and Draining	Construction (General)	Industrial Development	Hydrologic Modifications	Channelization	Commercial Development	Dredging	Resource Extraction	Utilities	Impoundments
Virgin Islands													
Virginia													
Washington													
West Virginia													
Wisconsin													
Wyoming	X	X	X								X		
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>		X							X				
Total	9	9	8	6	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2
X - The state, tribe, or territory reported that the source is responsible wetlands loss.													

Appendix D-4. Leading Sources of Recent Wetlands Losses

Jurisdiction	Development and Urban Growth	Agriculture	Road/Highway/Bridge Construction	Filling and Draining	Silviculture	Recreation	Public Projects	Construction of Wharves, Piers, Bulkheads	Marinas	Land Disposal	Landfills	Mosquito Control	Peat Mining
Virgin Islands													
Virginia													
Washington													
West Virginia													
Wisconsin													
Wyoming	X	X	X			X							
Yavapai-Prescott Reservation		X											
Total	9	9	8	6	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
X - The state, tribe, or territory reported that the source is responsible wetlands loss.													

Appendix D-4. Leading Sources of Recent Wetlands Losses

Jurisdiction	Development and Urban Growth	Agriculture	Road/Highway/Bridge Construction	Filling and Draining	Comment
Virgin Islands					The Virgin Islands note they have not had recent wetland losses.
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming	X	X	X		
Yavapai-Prescott Reservation		X			
Total	9	9	8	6	
X - The state, tribe, or territory reported that the source is responsible wetlands loss.					

Appendix D-5. Development of Wetland Water Quality Standards by States, Tribes, and Territories

Jurisdiction	In Place						Under Development						Proposed						Implementation Procedure	Comment
	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation		
Alabama																			Waters in wetlands are waters of the State, but wetlands are not defined for inherent values, e.g. habitat.	
Alaska																				
Arizona	X	X	X			X							X	X					No wetlands specific standards; instead, existing uses and narrative and numeric standards apply to wetlands.	
Arkansas																			State defines wetlands, but does not have wetlands standards or legislation. They are protected under water quality standards of the 404/401 process.	
California																				
Colorado																				
Connecticut		X	X			X	X												Municipal jurisdiction	
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>																				
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>							X									X	X	X		
Delaware						X	X	X	X										Wetlands are waters of the state; now developing criteria and uses for wetlands.	
District of Columbia	X					X				X							X		District has adopted a set of water quality standards for the protection of its wetlands.	
Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X					X	X		Wetlands are waters of the State, regulated using the same standards as other waterbodies.	Narrative and numeric biocriteria are in place but revisions are under development.
Georgia	X	X	X	X		X													Wetlands are waters of the State, regulated using the same standards as other waterbodies.	
Guam	X	X	X			X														
Hawaii							X						X						Wetlands are waters of the state - HI has developed a Wetlands Water Quality Advisory Committee to develop state wetland water quality standards.	
Idaho																			Idaho has developed Section 401 rules and regulations to offer protection to wetlands.	
Illinois																				
Indiana							X	X		X	X								Wetland water quality standards are currently under development.	

Appendix D-5. Development of Wetland Water Quality Standards by States, Tribes, and Territories

Jurisdiction	In Place						Under Development						Proposed						Implementation Procedure	Comment
	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation		
Iowa	X	X	X	X		X													Section 401, wasteload allocations, specific wetlands identified in State standards.	
Kansas	X	X		X		X									X		X		Waters of the state, designations for noncontact recreation, food procurement, and aquatic life support. Wetlands are waters of the State, but standards do not have specific wetlands criteria.	Nutrient criteria and biocriteria were proposed by EPA for adoption in 2003.
Kentucky <i>La Jolla Band of Indians</i>																				
Louisiana	X				X															
Maine <i>Manzanita Band</i>										X	X	X							No regs for implementing Section 401.	
Maryland	X	X	X																Wetlands are defined as waters of the State.	
Massachusetts	X	X	X									X								
Michigan																			State water quality standards apply to all waters of the State, including wetlands.	
Minnesota	X	X	X			X				X	X								Numeric criteria in place as compared to background concentrations of selected parameters. Interpretation and implementation is in its infancy. Wetlands-specific standards under consideration. Narrative criteria are currently considered applicable to wetlands.	
Mississippi		X																		
Missouri	X	X	X	X		X						X							Wetlands are waters of the State, but are not subdivided by classes or uses. Standards for lakes and rivers apply to wetlands, but may not be technically appropriate.	
Montana N Mariana Islands													X							
Nebraska	X	X	X	X		X													Specific standards for wetlands.	
Nevada																				
New Hampshire																			Waters of the state, but criteria have not been defined for wetlands.	NH has a strong wetlands law, which has minimized the need to use Section 401 for wetlands protection.

Appendix D-5. Development of Wetland Water Quality Standards by States, Tribes, and Territories

Jurisdiction	In Place					Under Development					Proposed					Implementation Procedure	Comment			
	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria			Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation
New Jersey																			Wetlands are waters of the State; in the future, New Jersey will develop standards for wetlands.	
New Mexico																			Wetlands are "waters of the State" and are protected under general standards, antidegradation policy, and any attainable use under state standards.	
New York						X	X	X											A number of guidance documents are being developed. DEC also has prepared administrative documents necessary for promulgating regulations.	
North Carolina																			Waters of the State; protected by State water quality laws and rules.	
North Dakota							X	X	X	X	X	X							Wetlands are waters of the State; the Health Department has proposed a standards implementation method.	
Ohio																				
Oklahoma																			Currently, there are no specific water quality standards for wetlands.	
Oregon	X			X		X				X	X	X							Oregon is considering additional criteria specifically tailored to wetlands.	
Pennsylvania	X	X	X			X													Wetlands are waters of the Commonwealth, subject to all provisions of PA's water quality standards.	
Puerto Rico						X													No standards or designated uses for wetlands, but antidegradation applies to wetlands.	
Rhode Island	X			X		X													State Section 401 Water Quality Certification and wetlands are waters of the State.	
South Carolina																			Wetlands assume standards of adjacent waterbodies; the State is considering wetlands-specific standards.	
South Dakota	X	X				X													Wetlands are waters of the State, designated for wildlife propagation and stock watering.	

Appendix D-5. Development of Wetland Water Quality Standards by States, Tribes, and Territories

Jurisdiction	In Place						Under Development					Proposed					Implementation Procedure	Comment		
	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria	Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation	Use Classification	Narrative Criteria	Numeric Criteria	Narrative Biocriteria			Numeric Biocriteria	Antidegradation
Tennessee																			No water quality standards specific to wetlands. As waters of the state, they are equally protected under existing use classifications and criteria.	
Texas <i>Torres-Martinez Desert Band</i> <i>Twenty-Nine Palms Band</i>		X				X													Waters of the State; considering wetlands standards and clarifying general criteria applied to wetlands.	
Utah						X													Antidegradation applies to wetlands. Surface waters on wetlands are protected under State water quality standards as are all other surface waters.	
Vermont	X	X	X	X		X						X							Classification system defines the level of protection afforded to a particular wetland.	Vermont also has wetland rules which protect the functions and values of many wetlands, regardless of size.
Virgin Islands		X				X	X		X											Revision of Water Quality Standards will be addressed in a 604(b) program.
Virginia																			Wetlands are waters of the state. Wetlands uses are tied to water quality standards.	
Washington																				
West Virginia						X				X	X		X							
Wisconsin	X	X		X		X													Program and criteria in place. Wetlands included in definition of waters of the state.	
Wyoming <i>Yavapai-Prescott Reservation</i>																				
Total	19	19	13	10	2	24	9	4	3	9	10	5	2	0	1	2	4	1		
X - State, tribe, or territory reported program status.																				