

Nos. 18-5179 & 18-5186

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT

---

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, et al.,  
*Plaintiffs-Appellants,*

v.

TODD T. SEMONITE, Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, et al.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Columbia

Nos. 1:17-cv-01361 & 1:17-cv-01574 (Hon. Royce C. Lamberth)

---

**FEDERAL APPELLEES' PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING**

---

Of Counsel:

MILTON W. BOYD  
MELANIE L. CASNER  
*Attorneys*  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
ERIC GRANT  
*Deputy Assistant Attorney General*  
MARK HAAG  
RACHEL HERON  
*Attorneys*  
Environment and Natural Resources Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 7415  
Washington, D.C. 20044  
(202) 514-0916  
rachel.heron@usdoj.gov

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....iii

GLOSSARY..... v

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 2

ARGUMENT ..... 5

A. There is at least a serious possibility that the Corps will be able to justify issuance of the permit following preparation of an environmental impact statement. .... 6

B. Vacating the permit would cause significant disruption and would imperil the public interest. .... 10

CONCLUSION ..... 14

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

ADDENDUM

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Alaska v. Andrus</i> , 580 F.2d 465 (D.C. Cir. 1978) .....	5, 7, 8
* <i>Allied-Signal, Inc. v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission</i> , 988 F.2d 146 (D.C. Cir. 1993) .....	1, 4, 5, 6, 10
<i>Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. EPA</i> , 898 F.2d 183 (D.C. Cir. 1990) .....	14
<i>Mayo v. Reynolds</i> , 875 F.3d 11 (D.C. Cir. 2017) .....	7
<i>North Carolina v. EPA</i> , 550 F.3d 1176 (D.C. Cir. 2008) .....	14
<i>Oglala Sioux Tribe v. U.S. NRC</i> , 896 F.3d 520 (D.C. Cir. 2018) .....	7, 8, 9
<i>Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility v. Hopper</i> , 827 F.3d 1077 (D.C. Cir. 2016) .....	5, 7, 8
<i>Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council</i> , 490 U.S. 332 (1989).....	7, 9
<i>Sierra Club v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</i> , 803 F.3d 31 (D.C. Cir. 2015) .....	13
* <i>Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative v. Veneman</i> , 289 F.3d 89 (D.C. Cir. 2002) .....	5, 7, 10, 12
<i>Susquehanna Int’l Grp., LLP v. SEC</i> , 866 F.3d 442 (D.C. Cir. 2017) .....	5, 6, 10, 13
<i>NRDC v. U.S. NRC</i> , 606 F.2d 1261 (D.C. Cir. 1979) .....	5, 7

## Regulations

33 C.F.R. § 322.3(a).....	11
33 C.F.R. § 325.6(b).....	11
33 C.F.R. § 326.3(d)(1).....	11

## **GLOSSARY**

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act

NPCA Plaintiff-Appellant National Parks Conservation Association

## INTRODUCTION

On March 1, 2019, this panel reversed the district court's decision upholding a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") permit authorizing construction of an electrical transmission line across the James River, which is needed to address an electric reliability emergency facing the Hampton Roads area of southeastern Virginia. Slip Op. at 26. The opinion instructs the district court to vacate the permit pending the Corps' preparation of an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). *Id.* The federal appellees respectfully request that the panel grant rehearing and modify its opinion: under this Court's decision in *Allied-Signal, Inc. v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 988 F.2d 146 (D.C. Cir. 1993), remand to the agency *without* vacating the permit is the appropriate remedy.

This panel's opinion did not address the *Allied-Signal* factors for deciding whether remand without vacatur is an appropriate remedy. Those factors weigh in favor of remand without vacatur here, particularly in light of the fact that the towers supporting the transmission line were completed and the line energized shortly before issuance of the opinion. As elaborated herein, there is a serious possibility that after completing additional NEPA analysis on remand, the Corps will once again determine that a permit should issue; and vacating the original permit in the interim would not help effectuate NEPA's goals. Vacatur *could*, however, create uncertainty regarding the legal status of the now fully operational transmission line, on which residents of Hampton Roads presently rely.

## BACKGROUND

This appeal arises from an action brought by the National Parks Conservation Association (“NPCA”) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation and others (collectively, “National Trust”). Those plaintiffs alleged that the Corps violated NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Clean Water Act when it issued a permit authorizing intervenor-appellee Virginia Electric & Power Company (“Dominion”) to construct an electric transmission line across the James River, near historic Jamestown. Slip Op. 5-6, 11.

The transmission line in question is needed to compensate for the loss of two coal-fired electric generating units that formerly served the Hampton Roads area of Virginia. JA168-69. Dominion retired those two facilities in order to comply with mercury and air toxics standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Clean Air Act. *Id.* To make up for the loss of that generating capacity, Dominion proposed to update the existing electrical-supply grid, including by constructing the transmission line at issue, to address an electric reliability emergency. JA156, 167-70, 183-85, 229-30. Without that transmission line, the PJM Interconnection emergency plan to prevent a multi-state power grid collapse imposes rolling blackouts on the Hampton Roads area—which self-evidently disrupt the health and safety (including provision of emergency services) of area residents. *See* Slip Op. 5-6; ECF No. 1757784, at 9-11; JA167-70, 183-85, 229-30.

Shortly after filing the complaint, NPCA moved for a preliminary injunction; the district court denied the motion, and NPCA did not appeal. Dist. Ct. No. 1:17-cv-01361, ECF No. 5, 59. After the court upheld the permit against all challenges, NPCA moved for injunction pending appeal, requesting that Dominion be prevented from building the seventeen steel lattice towers needed to support the line; the district court denied that motion as well. Dist. Ct. No. 1:17-cv-01361, ECF No. 111, 117.

NPCA then renewed its request for injunction pending appeal to this Court. *See generally* ECF No. 1738396. In opposing that motion, the Corps explained that the public equities “weigh[ed] heavily against an injunction because of the urgent need for the project to stabilize the North Hampton Roads electric grid.” ECF No. 1740184, at 26. As the Corps explained, shutting down the Yorktown coal-fired generating units to comply with the Clean Air Act had created “serious reliability problems” for the area’s 590,000 residents and the multi-state power grid. *Id.* at 26-27. Without those units, and until completion of the transmission line and towers, the emergency plan for the area imposed rolling blackouts on the Hampton Roads area during periods of peak electricity demand, which “would deny power to hundreds of thousands of residents, military facilities, hospitals, and emergency services.” *Id.* Delay in completing construction of the towers would have imperiled the public by extending the threat of blackouts. *Id.*; *see also* ECF No. 1740196, at 17-22.

This Court denied NPCA’s motion for injunction pending appeal on July 31, 2018. ECF No. 1743198, at 1. Construction of the transmission line’s supporting

towers proceeded and the transmission line was energized in late February 2019. ECF No. 1782940, Add. 33; Letter from PJM Interconnection LLC to U.S. Dep't of Energy 3 (Mar. 1, 2019), *available at* <https://www.energy.gov/oe/downloads/federal-power-act-section-202c-pjm-interconnection-dominion-energy-virginia-2017-0>. The remaining work to be done under the permit involves some site-restoration work, as well as other steps intended to improve public and navigational safety around the existing structures (e.g., adding “bumpers” to the already-installed foundations and navigation lights on already-erected towers). ECF No. 1782940, Add. 33.

After the line was energized, this panel issued its March 1 opinion, holding that the Corps had violated NEPA by failing to prepare an environmental impact statement prior to approving the permit. Slip Op. 12-24. The opinion accordingly reversed and remanded to the district court. *Id.* 26. Although Dominion had expressly requested (consistent with *Allied-Signal*) that this Court order further proceedings to determine an appropriate remedy if it held that the Corps had violated NEPA, ECF No. 1757694, at 43, the opinion stated that the district court should “vacate Dominion’s permit.” Slip Op. 26. The opinion did not consider the *Allied-Signal* factors before reaching that conclusion. *Id.* Nor did this panel have before it the recent factual developments regarding completion of construction and the disruption that vacating the permit could cause. *Cf. id.* at 6 (describing construction of line and supporting towers in future-conditional tense).

## ARGUMENT

### **Remand without vacatur is the appropriate remedy.**

This Court has repeatedly held that inadequately supported agency action “need not necessarily be vacated.” *Allied-Signal*, 988 F.2d at 150; *accord, e.g., Susquehanna Int’l Grp., LLP v. SEC*, 866 F.3d 442, 451 (D.C. Cir. 2017); *Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative v. Veneman*, 289 F.3d 89, 97-98 (D.C. Cir. 2002). Instead, the “decision whether to vacate depends on the seriousness of the [action]’s deficiencies (and thus the extent of doubt whether the agency chose correctly) and the disruptive consequences of an interim change that may itself be changed.” *Allied-Signal*, 988 F.2d at 150-51. In the NEPA context in particular, before halting federal action supported by insufficient NEPA analysis, this Court conducts a “particularized analysis of the violations that have occurred,” weighing “the possibilities for relief” and “any countervailing considerations of public interest.” *Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility v. Hopper*, 827 F.3d 1077, 1084 (D.C. Cir. 2016); *see also NRDC v. U.S. NRC*, 606 F.2d 1261, 1272 (D.C. Cir. 1979); *Alaska v. Andrus*, 580 F.2d 465, 485 (D.C. Cir. 1978), vacated in part on other grounds, 439 U.S. 922 (1978).

As stated above, this panel’s opinion instructs the district court to vacate the Corps permit at issue without conducting the requisite *Allied-Signal* inquiry. But the *Allied-Signal* factors weigh heavily in favor of remand without vacating the permit. As to the first factor, without downplaying the seriousness of the deficiencies found by this Court, there is at least a “serious possibility” the Corps may still issue the permit

after preparing the environmental impact statement, which has been sufficient in past cases for this Court to conclude that remand without vacatur is appropriate. 988 F.2d at 151. As to the second factor, vacating the permit while the remand proceeds could cause serious disruption and harm to the public interest—or at minimum create needless legal uncertainty—by calling into question the legal status of the already-operational transmission line and its already-constructed support towers. Such disruption would be for naught, if the Corps does in fact conclude based on the new NEPA analysis that granting a permit is proper.

**A. There is at least a serious possibility that the Corps will be able to justify issuance of the permit following preparation of an environmental impact statement.**

The first *Allied-Signal* factor directs the Court to consider the “seriousness” of any defect identified in the agency action. 988 F.2d at 150. In weighing that consideration, the touchstone is whether such defect is so grave that the agency would be unable to justify reaching the same conclusion after completing the remand. *See id.* at 150-51. To justify a remand without vacatur, the agency need not establish that it *will* or even is *likely* to reach the same conclusion on remand. *See id.* Instead, this Court deems remand without vacatur appropriate where the agency can show “at least a serious possibility” that the agency “will be able to substantiate its decision on remand.” *Id.* at 151. In other decisions, the Court has described the standard the agency must meet still more leniently. *See Susquehanna Int’l*, 866 F.3d at 451 (remanding without vacatur where agency “*may* be able to approve the Plan once again, after

conducting a proper analysis on remand” (emphasis added)); *Sugar Cane Growers*, 289 F.3d at 98 (remanding without vacatur where “it is at least possible” that agency could justify its original decision on remand).

NEPA presents a special context, in that NEPA requires federal agencies to consider significant environmental impacts before making a decision, but it does not constrain the *substance* of agency decision-making. *See Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 350 (1989). Accordingly even where an agency’s NEPA documents themselves may be insufficient, an agency generally remains legally free to take any associated actions after completing additional analysis—although, of course, the agency will proceed mindful of any new findings revealed by that analysis. *See id.*; *see also Mayo v. Reynolds*, 875 F.3d 11, 15-16 (D.C. Cir. 2017).

In this context, this Court has not hesitated to remand without vacating associated agency actions or enjoining activity authorized by those actions, *see, e.g., Alaska*, 580 F.2d at 486; *Public Employees*, 827 F.3d at 1084, notwithstanding this Court’s recognition that failure to comply with NEPA may be a serious deficiency, *see Oglala Sioux Tribe v. U.S. NRC*, 896 F.3d 520, 536 (D.C. Cir. 2018). Indeed, even in a case—like this one—where the agency failed to prepare an environmental impact statement that the Court deemed required, this Court has declined to enjoin the activities to be evaluated in such environmental impact statement, in light of the equities. *NRDC*, 606 F.2d at 1272-73 (declining to enjoin “continued construction of

the twenty-two waste storage tanks involved in this case” pending completion of an environmental impact statement regarding those tanks).

The case against vacatur is particularly strong where activities authorized by an agency decision have already proceeded to the point that vacating that decision would no longer practically serve NEPA’s goals of allowing the agency to consider all alternatives before resources are committed to a particular path. As this Court has explained, panels that have chosen to disrupt projects after uncovering a NEPA deficiency “have done so primarily to preserve for the relevant decisionmaker the full opportunity to choose among alternatives that is contemplated by NEPA.” *Alaska*, 580 F.2d at 485; *see also Oglala Sioux Tribe*, 896 F.3d at 536 (expressing concern that construction could proceed before environmental impact statement revealed full range of potential cultural and historical artifacts to be avoided); *cf. Public Employees*, 827 F.3d at 1084 (declining to vacate lease and other regulatory approvals, but enjoining further construction pending additional NEPA analysis).

Applying those standards to the facts of this case, the first factor weighs in favor of remand without vacatur. At the outset, the Corps recognizes that the failure to prepare an environmental impact statement where one is required is not a trivial matter, notwithstanding that NEPA’s requirements are procedural rather than substantive in nature. *See Oglala Sioux Tribe*, 896 F.3d at 536. The Corps takes seriously this panel’s determination that the agency’s decision not to prepare an environmental impact statement was flawed, and is committed to preparing a statement on remand.

For that reason, the Corps does not request any change in the opinion language “direct[ing] the Corps to prepare an environmental impact statement.” Slip Op. 26.

Under *Allied-Signal*, however, the seriousness of the defect is not considered in a vacuum, but with an eye to whether the agency may be able to stand by its original decision following remand. Here, although this panel has determined that the Corps’ NEPA analysis is flawed, there is at least a serious possibility that the permit itself may be reissued after an environmental impact statement is prepared, given that NEPA does not require that an agency reach any particular substantive outcome after taking the requisite hard look at significant environmental impacts. *See Robertson*, 490 U.S. at 350.

To be sure, this Court has recognized that in some instances, failure to prepare an adequate environmental impact statement weighs in favor of vacatur, “because the point of NEPA is to require an adequate [environmental impact statement] before a project goes forward.” *Oglala Sioux Tribe*, 896 F.3d at 536. As explained above, the seriousness of failing to prepare an environmental impact statement may provide impetus for vacatur where vacatur would preserve the status quo ante. But that rationale can carry little weight in a case like this one, where in the absence of a preliminary injunction, the authorized towers and transmission line have already been constructed and the status quo thus already altered. *See infra* pp. 3-4.

Finally, although NEPA will not *bar* the Corps from reissuing the permit following preparation of an environmental impact statement, the Corps acknowledges

that it is conceivable that the process will reveal information that could change the Corps' evaluation of the appropriateness of the permit, or that could bear on whether other substantive legal standards for granting the permit are satisfied. The standard applied by this Court, however, does not require the agency to show that it is *certain* that it will be able to justify its original decision following remand—only that there is a meaningful possibility. *Allied-Signal*, 988 F.2d at 150-51; *Susquehanna Int'l*, 866 F.3d at 451; *Sugar Cane Growers*, 289 F.3d at 98. The Corps has done so here.

**B. Vacating the permit would cause significant disruption and would imperil the public interest.**

The second *Allied-Signal* factor weighs heavily in favor of remand without vacatur, because vacating the permit would throw into doubt the status of the already-operational transmission line, which is presently serving critical energy-reliability needs. *See* JA167-70, 183-85, 229-30; ECF No. 1782940, Add. 33. As context, the permit that this panel's opinion instructs the district court to vacate authorized Dominion to dredge and fill in waters of the United States, which permission was required under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. *See* JA147-55. It also authorized Dominion to maintain an obstruction affecting navigable waters under the Rivers and Harbors Act. *See id.* NPCA sought both a preliminary injunction and injunction pending appeal to enjoin that work under the permit, but injunctions were denied in both instances. As a result, the support towers have already been constructed and the line is already electrified and in use. *See supra* pp. 3-4. Moreover, the two coal-fired

generating stations that formerly served the Hampton Roads area have been retired in reliance on the now-energized line. Letter from PJM Interconnection LLC to U.S. Dep't of Energy, *supra*, at 3.

Against this backdrop, the effects of vacating the permit could be highly disruptive. While vacatur now would have no practical effect on the permitted dredging and filling under the Clean Water Act to the extent that those activities are already complete, it would cast legal uncertainty on Dominion's right to maintain the structures under the Rivers and Harbors Act. The Corps has interpreted that statute to require persons maintaining an obstruction to navigable water to obtain a permit that covers the lifetime of the obstruction. *See* 33 C.F.R. §§ 322.3(a), 325.6(b).

Vacating Dominion's permit would therefore open it to the contention that it is maintaining an unauthorized obstruction in violation of law, such that the line and towers must be removed while the remand proceeds.<sup>1</sup> Actual removal of the towers, or even additional litigation or other controversy about whether the towers should be removed during remand, would be particularly unjustified here, given the significant

---

<sup>1</sup> The Corps has authority to impose initial corrective measures against persons maintaining an unauthorized obstruction, including removal of such obstruction. 33 C.F.R. § 326.3(d)(1). In determining in the exercise of its enforcement discretion whether any corrective measures are appropriate, the Corps is to consider "whether serious jeopardy to life, property, or important public resources . . . may be reasonably anticipated to occur during the period required for the ultimate resolution of the violation." *Id.*

possibility (discussed in the previous section) that the remand would result in a determination that the permit should in fact reissue.

For these reasons, this Court's analysis in *Sugar Cane Growers* should carry the day. In that case, the plaintiffs challenged a payment-in-kind program implemented by the Department of Agriculture for the 2001 growing season. 289 F.3d at 91. As here, the plaintiffs sought but were denied preliminary relief preventing the agency action from going into effect. *Id.* at 97. As a result, "the program was launched and crops were plowed under" while litigation was pending. *Id.* Although this Court determined that the program's launch "clearly violate[d]" relevant law, it recognized that the "egg has been scrambled and there is no apparent way to restore the status quo ante." *Id.* Accordingly, the Court remanded without vacating, notwithstanding the seriousness of the program's legal defects, because it was "at least possible" that the program could be justified on remand. *Id.* at 97-98.

The same result is appropriate here. After this Court declined to issue a preliminary injunction, Dominion had the legal right to proceed with construction of its line and towers, and it did so. In the parlance of *Sugar Growers*, the egg has now been scrambled. At this point, vacating the permit authorizing construction of the towers and line would not preserve the status quo prior to construction, which no longer exists; however, vacatur could cause significant disruption to the *present* status quo by fomenting needless controversy regarding the electric-supply infrastructure on which Hampton Roads residents and the multi-state power grid now rely. Indeed, the

only apparent way to restore the *previous* status quo would be to require Dominion to remove the line and towers. But while such a command is conceivably within this Court's power, *see Sierra Club v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 803 F.3d 31, 43 (D.C. Cir. 2015), the justification for creating such a “logistical nightmare” that would thrust the multi-state region back into a bona fide electrical grid emergency is slight, where “the parties may well awaken from that nightmare” just in time for the permit authorizing those structures to be re-issued. *Susquehanna Int'l Grp.*, 866 F.3d at 451. To be sure, should the Corps conclude upon remand that a permit should not be issued, the line and towers might need to come down. But decommissioning the line and towers, if eventually deemed necessary, will not be “materially more difficult if done then rather than now.” *Id.*

For similar reasons, vacating the permit at this point would not serve the public interest. The potential for any interim disruption to NPCA and National Trust members' aesthetic enjoyment of the James River while the towers remain standing does not justify the high cost to the Hampton Roads public and the multi-state power grid of even the possibility of removing the greatly needed transmission line and towers. This is especially so when there is a serious possibility that the line and towers may be validly authorized following remand. As discussed above, moreover, the bulk of potentially environmentally disruptive work on the project has already been done. *See supra* p. 4. Much of what remains to be done under the permit is supplemental activity intended to restore the site and improve navigational safety. *See* ECF No.

1782940, Add. 33. This Court has repeatedly recognized that remand without vacatur is appropriate when vacatur would primarily serve to deprive the public of incremental protections. *See, e.g., North Carolina v. EPA*, 550 F.3d 1176, 1178 (D.C. Cir. 2008); *Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. EPA*, 898 F.2d 183, 190 (D.C. Cir. 1990).

For these reasons, the second *Allied-Signal* factor weighs heavily in favor of remanding without vacating the permit at issue.<sup>2</sup>

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the federal appellees respectfully request that this panel revise its opinion, in light of *Allied-Signal*, to direct the district court to remand to the agency without vacating the underlying permit.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rachel Heron

JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK

*Assistant Attorney General*

ERIC GRANT

*Deputy Assistant Attorney General*

MARK HAAG

RACHEL HERON

*Attorneys*

Environment and Natural Resources Division

U.S. Department of Justice

Of Counsel:

MILTON W. BOYD

MELANIE L. CASNER

*Attorneys*

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

April 15, 2019

90-1-4-15010

---

<sup>2</sup> To the extent this panel believes additional development of the record surrounding the equities is necessary, it would be appropriate to remand to the district court with instructions to consider whether the second *Allied-Signal* factor favors remand without vacatur.

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing petition complies with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 35(b)(2)(A), because the petition was produced using a computer and contains 3,470 words.

/s/ Rachel Heron  
RACHEL HERON

Counsel for Federal Appellees

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing/attached document with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit using the Appellate Electronic Filing system on April 15, 2019.

/s/ Rachel Heron  
RACHEL HERON

Counsel for Federal Appellees

**ADDENDUM**

**INDEX TO ADDENDUM**

Certificate as to Parties .....Add. 1

Slip Opinion (Mar. 1, 2019).....Add. 2

## CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rules 28(a)(1) and 35(c), the undersigned counsel certifies as follows:

The parties and *amici* who appeared before the district court were:

(1) National Parks Conservation Association, National Trust for Historic Preservation; Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, *Plaintiffs*;

(2) Todd T. Semonite, Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Mark T. Esper, Secretary of the Army, *Defendants*;

(3) Virginia Electric & Power Company (d/b/a Dominion Energy Virginia, *Intervenor-Defendant*;

(4) Coalition to Protect America's National Parks, Inc.; Jonathan B. Jarvis; American Rivers; Sierra Club; Mattaponi Indian Tribe, Scenic Virginia, P.J.M. Interconnection, LLC, *Amici curiae*.

The following additional *amici* appeared before this Court: the Lawyers' Committee for Cultural Heritage, the Cultural Landscape Foundation.

/s/ Rachel Heron  
RACHEL HERON

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

---

Argued December 7, 2018

Decided March 1, 2019

No. 18-5179

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,  
APPELLANT

v.

TODD T. SEMONITE, LIEUTENANT GENERAL, ET AL.,  
APPELLEES

---

Consolidated with 18-5186

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the District of Columbia  
(No. 1:17-cv-01361)  
(No. 1:17-cv-01574)

---

*Matthew G. Adams* argued the cause and filed the briefs  
for appellants National Trust for Historic Preservation, et al.

*William S. Eubanks II* argued the cause for appellant  
National Parks Conservation Association. With him on the  
briefs was *Eric R. Glitzenstein*.

*J. Blanding Holman* was on the brief for *amici curiae* The  
Lawyer's Committee for Cultural Heritage Preservation, et al.  
in support of appellant.

*Tyler Joseph Sniff* was on the brief for *amici curiae* 18th Director of the National Park Service Jonathan B. Jarvis, et al. in support of appellant National Parks Conservation Association.

*Dustin J. Maghamfar*, Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, argued the cause for federal appellees. With him on the brief were *Jeffrey H. Wood*, Acting Assistant Attorney General, *Eric A. Grant*, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, and *Andrew C. Mergen*, *Mark R. Haag*, and *Heather E. Gange*, Attorneys.

*Elbert Lin* argued the cause for appellee Virginia Electric and Power Company. With him on the brief were *Eric J. Murdock*, *Harry M. Johnson, III*, and *Timothy L. McHugh*.

*Michael J. Thompson* and *Brett K. White* were on the brief for *amici curiae* PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. in support of appellees.

Before: GARLAND, *Chief Judge*, and TATEL and MILLETT, *Circuit Judges*.

Opinion for the Court filed by *Circuit Judge* TATEL.

TATEL, *Circuit Judge*: In order to “create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony,” the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4331(a), requires any federal agency issuing a construction permit, opening new lands to drilling, or undertaking any other “major” project to take a hard look at the project’s environmental consequences, *id.* § 4332(2)(C), including the impacts it may have on “important historic . . . aspects of our national heritage,” *id.* § 4331(b). To this end, the

agency must develop an environmental impact statement (EIS) that identifies and rigorously appraises the project's environmental effects, unless it finds that the project will have "no significant impact." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9(a)(1). And that is what happened here. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") granted a permit allowing a utility company to build a series of electrical transmission towers across the historic James River, from whose waters Captain John Smith explored the New World, and it did so without preparing an EIS because it found that the project would have "no significant impact" on the historic treasures along the river. As explained below, however, the Corps's "no significant impact" finding was arbitrary and capricious: important questions about both the Corps's chosen methodology and the scope of the project's impact remain unanswered, and federal and state agencies with relevant expertise harbor serious misgivings about locating a project of this magnitude in a region of such singular importance to the nation's history. Accordingly, we reverse the district court's decision to the contrary and remand with instructions to vacate the permit and direct the Corps to prepare an environmental impact statement.

## I.

Over 400 years ago, Captain John Smith arrived on the shores of what is now known as the Chesapeake Bay. Keen on learning more about the unfamiliar land, Captain Smith voyaged up the winding James River, passing through lush forests and under open skies. During his voyages, Smith produced "maps and writings [that] influenced exploration and settlement in the New World for over a century." 152 Cong. Rec. 22,282 (2006) (statement of Rep. Davis). These journeys came to symbolize our nation's founding and to serve as an equally important reminder of one of the darkest episodes in our history—the settlers' devastation of Native American

populations, including the “eventual collapse of the Powhatan polity.” John S. Salmon, Project Historian, National Park Service, Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Water Trail Statement of National Significance 2 (2006).

Long after Smith’s voyages, the river “serv[ed] as a strategic transportation corridor that shaped the settlement and commerce of the region.” H.R. Res. 16, 110th Cong. preamble (2007). Indeed, “the economic, political, religious, and social institutions that developed during the first [nine] decades” of the corridor’s settlement “have profound effects on the United States” to this day. Jamestown 400th Commemoration Commission Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 106-565, § 2(a)(3), 114 Stat. 2812, 2812. The same region commanded center stage through the nation’s infancy, bearing witness to “the British surrender that marked the end of the American Revolution.” Colonial National Historical Park Amendments, S. Rep. No. 104-30, at 2 (1995).

Honoring these ties to our nation’s past, Congress and several federal agencies have established a series of “historic resources” in and around the Chesapeake Bay, including Jamestown, Carter’s Grove National Historic Landmark, and the Captain John Smith National Historic Trail (“Historic Trail”), the nation’s only congressionally-protected water trail. Due to the James River’s “extraordinary historic, economic, recreational, and environmental importance,” Congress recognizes it as “America’s Founding River.” H.R. Res. 16 §§ 1, 2. According to one representative, Congress “[d]esignat[ed] this [H]istoric [T]rail . . . to spur efforts to protect and restore the region’s historic and environmental assets.” 152 Cong. Rec. 22,283 (2006) (statement of Rep. Castle). Other members of Congress observed that the region “represents a lasting tribute to the American spirit of discovery and exploration,” *id.* at 22,282 (statement of Rep. Davis),


affording visitors “the opportunity to marvel at some of the same sites that Captain Smith and his crew beheld 400 years ago,” *id.* at 22,283 (statement of Rep. Hoyer).

The National Park Service, an agency of the Department of the Interior, pursuant to its obligation “to conserve the scenery [and] natural and historic objects” of our national parks, 54 U.S.C. § 100101(a), acts as steward of these resources, striving to “offer[] visitors an opportunity to vicariously share the experience of Smith and his crew” through views “evocative of the seventeenth century,” Park Service, A Conservation Strategy for the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail Introduction 3 (2013). To this end, and in accordance with its conservation “management plan” for the Historic Trail, the Service seeks to “[m]aximize the visual and historical integrity of the visitor experience” by, among other things, ensuring that all new utility lines are underground. Park Service, General Management Plan: Colonial National Historical Park 19, 34 (1993) (“Management Plan”).

Enter the demands of modernity. Although the approximately fifty-mile leg of the James River involved in this case has retained its seventeenth-century charm, the rest of Virginia has kept pace with modern development, which means it depends on electricity. Following the 2012 issuance of an Environmental Protection Agency rule requiring power generation facilities to reduce certain air pollutant emissions, *see* 77 Fed. Reg. 9304 (Feb. 16, 2012), Virginia Electric and Power Company (“Dominion”) determined that, in order to comply with the rule, it would have to retire two coal-fired power generators. To compensate for the resulting electricity shortfall, Dominion applied in 2013 to the Corps, which has jurisdiction over certain projects concerning “waters of the United States,” *see* 33 C.F.R. § 328.1 (internal quotation marks

omitted), for a permit to construct a new electrical switching station and two transmission lines. Supported by seventeen 250-or-so-foot steel-lattice transmission towers, the line at issue here would stretch for eight miles, four of which would cross the James River and cut through the middle of the historic district encompassing Jamestown and other historic resources. See Figure 1.

*Figure 1: Overview Map of Project and Historic Properties (created by Industrial Economics, Inc.), Joint Appendix (J.A.) 495*



Before it could greenlight the undertaking, known as the Surry-Skiffes Creek-Wheaton project (“Project”), the Corps had to satisfy several statutory obligations. First, as relevant here, NEPA required the Corps to consider alternatives to the Project and to prepare an “environmental impact statement” if the Project would “significantly affect[] the quality of the human environment,” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C)—an analysis which must take into account effects on historic resources, 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8. But the Corps could bypass preparation of an

EIS if, based on a preliminary “environmental assessment,” it determined that the Project would have “no significant impact” on the environment. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9. Second, the Clean Water Act required the Corps to determine that no “practicable alternative” existed that “would have less adverse effect on the aquatic ecosystem.” *Id.* § 230.12(a)(3)(i). Third, the National Historic Preservation Act (“Preservation Act”) required the Corps to “take into account the effect of the undertaking on any historic property,” 54 U.S.C. § 306108, and, if the project might “directly and adversely affect any National Historic Landmark,” to take steps “to minimize harm to the landmark,” *id.* § 306107.

Pursuant to these obligations, the Corps studied the Project’s environmental impacts and considered nearly thirty alternatives. In doing so, the Corps relied on a Cultural Resources Effects Assessment prepared by Dominion and its consultants, which included a series of photo simulations that superimposed mockups of the proposed towers over the existing landscape. In its initial environmental assessment, the Corps determined that the Project would adversely but non-significantly affect historic resources, rendering an EIS unnecessary.

At various points throughout the process, the Corps, as required by Preservation Act regulations, reached out to “consulting parties,” which include local governments and other “individuals and organizations with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking.” 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c). It also invited other federal agencies and the public to comment on its NEPA process. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C) (requiring an agency to “consult with . . . any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise” and to provide any resulting statements “to the public”).

And comment they did, to the tune of 50,000 submissions, many of which urged the Corps to prepare an EIS. Condensing the gist of thousands of comments into one simple but clear proposition, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (“Advisory Council”)—the independent federal agency tasked with the “preservation of historic propert[ies],” 54 U.S.C. § 306101(a)(1)—warned that the Project “threaten[s] to irreparably alter a relatively unspoiled and evocative landscape that provides context and substance for the historic properties encompassed within.” Letter from Advisory Council Chairman 1 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 414.

Quite a few commenters also pointed to perceived errors in the Corps’s determination that the Project would not significantly impact, in the Advisory Council’s words, “historic properties of transcendent national significance.” Letter from Advisory Council Director 1 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 411. Writing to the Corps fully twenty times, the Park Service warned that the Project “would forever degrade, damage, and destroy the historic setting of these iconic resources.” Letter from Park Service Director 1 (Dec. 11, 2015), J.A. 1829. The Virginia Department of Historic Resources feared “irreparabl[e] alter[ation] [of] the character of the area.” Letter from Virginia Department of Historic Resources Director 2 (Nov. 13, 2015), J.A. 1855. Others, including then-Interior Secretary Sally Jewell, the Council on Environmental Quality, and many non-governmental organizations, sounded similar alarms.

Other commenters identified what they viewed as serious flaws in the Corps’s methodologies. To give a flavor of these concerns, a specialist at the Department of Energy’s Argonne National Laboratory (“Argonne”) found the Corps’s analyses “scientifically unsound” and “completely contrary to accepted professional practice.” Response from Robert Sullivan ¶ 1

(Jan. 10, 2017), J.A. 534. The Park Service, the Advisory Council, and others critiqued the Corps's socioeconomic, visual, and cumulative effects analyses.

Still other commenters criticized the Corps's evaluation of alternatives. Summarizing several such concerns, the Advisory Council wrote that the "alternatives analysis was extremely problematic," that the National Parks Conservation Association ("Conservation Association") had funded a study "that challenged the accuracy of the data and assumptions used by Dominion," and that the engineering firm retained by the National Trust for Historic Preservation ("National Trust") had developed alternatives that "would cost less to construct, be built more quickly, and meet all relevant reliability standards." Letter from Advisory Council Chairman 3 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 416. According to one of the Corps's own specialists, Dominion could yet "take a harder look at the alternatives" and the company's cost estimates for the alternatives were "bloated and excessive." Sustainable Program Manager Review 3-4, J.A. 540-41.

While this deluge poured in, the Corps consulted with various agencies, conducted site visits, and twice directed Dominion to revise its photo simulations. Upon reviewing these amended analyses, the Corps and Dominion still believed that the Project, alone among all options, met the requisite reliability, cost, and timing parameters.

Commenters remained unsatisfied. Several agencies warned that the revised analyses, as the Park Service put it, still contained "fundamental flaws" that, though "repeatedly identified," nonetheless "remain[ed] unresolved." Letter from Park Service Acting Regional Director 1 (Jan. 12, 2017), J.A. 475. Indeed, the "majority of the consulting parties" found Dominion's amendments "superficial and inadequate." Letter

from Advisory Council Chairman 3 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 416. Underscoring that such concerns endured past the final round of revisions, the Park Service director during this process submitted an amicus brief in his now-private capacity, emphasizing that, since the Project will “forever . . . destroy the historic setting of these iconic resources,” the Park Service, were it the agency with permitting authority, could not approve the Project “because its adverse impacts are so significant.” 18th Director of the National Park Service Jonathan B. Jarvis Br. 7 (internal quotation marks omitted).

The process reached a temporary denouement in 2017. Following the change in administration, then-newly appointed (now-former) Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke met with the Corps, acknowledged its “thoughtful and thorough consideration of the issues,” and announced that he “st[ood] ready to sign a final agreement as a concurring party.” Letter from Ryan Zinke 1 (Mar. 30, 2017), J.A. 420. Shortly thereafter, the Corps issued a permit to Dominion. In the accompanying Memorandum for the Record (“Memo”), the Corps acknowledged that the Project would “intrude upon the viewsheds of historic properties and on a unique and highly scenic section of the James River.” Memo § 10.3.8, J.A. 257. Nonetheless, the Corps concluded, the effects on these “national treasure[s]” were “moderate at most” and “inherently subjective.” *Id.* §§ 10.3.8, 12.3, J.A. 257, 266 (internal quotation marks omitted). Where visible at all, it explained, the transmission towers would not “block[]” or “dominate” the view and would join existing “modern visual intrusions,” such as the Busch Gardens amusement park and recreational boat traffic. *Id.* § 10.3.8, J.A. 257–58.

The Corps also executed a Memorandum of Agreement with Dominion, in which the company agreed to offset the harm to historic resources by, among other things, periodically

reviewing the continued need for the Project and investing in Virginia's historic preservation efforts. Although a few other participants, including Interior, signed this Memorandum, most declined to do so because they remained concerned "that the adverse effects resulting from this undertaking [could not] be mitigated." Letter from Advisory Council Chairman 2 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 415.

The National Trust, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, and the Conservation Association (collectively, the "Conservation Groups") sued in district court alleging that the Corps failed to satisfy its NEPA, Clean Water Act, and Preservation Act obligations. The district court found that the "Corps made a 'fully informed and well-considered' decision" and granted summary judgment to the agency. *National Parks Conservation Association v. Semonite*, 311 F. Supp. 3d 350, 361 (D.D.C. 2018) (quoting *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resource Defense Council*, 435 U.S. 519, 558 (1978)).

On appeal, the Conservation Groups present three arguments: that due to the significance of the Project's impacts, the Corps was required to prepare an EIS; that the Corps's alternatives analyses fell short of the requirements imposed by both NEPA and the Clean Water Act; and that the Corps failed to fulfill its obligations under section 110(f) of the Preservation Act, 54 U.S.C. § 306107, which requires an agency to minimize harm to any National Historic Landmark "directly and adversely" affected by a project. "We review the district court's decision to grant summary judgment de novo." *Aera Energy LLC v. Salazar*, 642 F.3d 212, 218 (D.C. Cir. 2011).

12

**II.**

We begin with the Conservation Groups' argument that NEPA required the Corps to prepare an EIS because, as they see it, the Project will significantly impact historic resources. "Our role in reviewing [the Corps's] decision not to prepare an EIS is a limited one, designed primarily to ensure that no arguably significant consequences have been ignored." *Myersville Citizens for a Rural Community, Inc. v. FERC*, 783 F.3d 1301, 1322 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (internal quotation marks omitted). Responsible for determining whether the Corps's decision was "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law," 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), we ask whether the Corps is "able to make a convincing case for its finding" of no significant impact. *Sierra Club v. U.S. Department of Transportation*, 753 F.2d 120, 127 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

"NEPA's primary function is 'information-forcing,' compelling federal agencies to take a hard and honest look at the environmental consequences of their decisions." *American Rivers v. FERC*, 895 F.3d 32, 49 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (internal citations omitted). To satisfy this "hard look" requirement, the Corps must prepare an EIS for any project "significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). Under NEPA's regulatory scheme, crafted by the Council on Environmental Quality, such effects can be, among others, historic, aesthetic, or cultural. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8. Congress has declared that "preserv[ing] important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage" constitutes an important goal of the statute. 42 U.S.C. § 4331(b)(4). And we in turn have recognized that protecting such resources is "an interest that NEPA's procedural mandate was intended to vindicate." *Oglala Sioux Tribe v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 896 F.3d 520, 529 (D.C. Cir. 2018).

As mentioned earlier, if the Corps believes that a project may not require an EIS, it may first prepare an environmental assessment to determine whether a “no significant impact” determination might find support in the record. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9(a).

During the NEPA process, the Corps must consult agencies with “special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(a)(2) (requiring agencies to use the resulting analysis “to the maximum extent possible”). But, as the lead agency, the Corps, which “b[ears] the ultimate statutory responsibility” for the Project, “does not have to follow [other agencies’] comments slavishly—it just has to take them seriously.” *Citizens Against Burlington, Inc. v. Busey*, 938 F.2d 190, 201 (D.C. Cir. 1991).

Whether a project has significant environmental impacts, thus triggering the need to produce an EIS, depends on its “context” (region, locality) and “intensity” (“severity of impact”). 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27. Here, because all parties agree that the historically-saturated “context”—i.e., this 50-mile stretch of the James River—qualifies as significant, our inquiry focuses on the “intensity” element, which enumerates ten factors that “should be considered.” *Id.* § 1508.27(b). Implicating any one of the factors may be sufficient to require development of an EIS. *See Grand Canyon Trust v. FAA*, 290 F.3d 339, 347 (D.C. Cir. 2002), *as amended* (Aug. 27, 2002) (granting a petition for review after finding a project implicated one factor, without reaching additional factors). The district court found that “none of the significance factors weigh in favor of [the] contention that an EIS is required.” *National Parks Conservation Association*, 311 F. Supp. 3d at 363. The Conservation Groups disagree, arguing that the Project implicates three such factors: “[t]he degree to which the effects

on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial,” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(4); “[u]nique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources,” *id.* § 1508.27(b)(3); and the “degree to which the action may adversely affect districts [or] sites . . . listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places,” *id.* § 1508.27(b)(8). We consider each in turn.

#### A.

The first factor considers “[t]he degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(4). The word “controversial,” we held in *Town of Cave Creek v. FAA*, refers to situations where “‘substantial dispute exists as to the size, nature, or effect of the major federal action.’” 325 F.3d 320, 331 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (quoting *North American Wild Sheep v. U.S. Department of Agriculture*, 681 F.2d 1172, 1182 (9th Cir. 1982)) (emphasis in original). And as we explained in *Fund for Animals v. Frizzell*, “‘certainly something more is required’ for a highly controversial finding ‘besides the fact that some people may be highly agitated and be willing to go to court over the matter.’” 530 F.2d 982, 988 n.15 (D.C. Cir. 1975) (per curiam) (emphasis added).

According to the Conservation Groups, “[w]here, as here, two federal agencies have argued for years over the ‘size,’ ‘nature,’ and ‘effect’ of the project on resources under [the Park Service’s] jurisdiction (as have other agencies with ‘special expertise’ under NEPA), the Court’s test for ‘controversy’ fits like a glove.” Conservation Association Br. 22 (emphasis omitted). For its part, the Corps asserts that, under *Cave Creek* and *Frizzell*, it “‘reasonably concluded that comments demanding an EIS ‘represent passion for the affected

resources' . . . rather than substantive dispute." Corps Br. 38 (quoting Memo § 12.3, J.A. 266). The Conservation Groups acknowledge that a highly controversial finding must rest on more than passionate opposition, but they insist that the criticism of the Corps's NEPA process rises to the requisite "something more."

The Conservation Groups first point out that much of the disagreement centers on perceived defects in the Corps's methodology and that, as the district court observed, "[m]any courts have found 'something more' to be scientific or other evidence that reveals flaws in the methods or data relied upon by the agency in reaching its conclusions." *National Parks Conservation Association*, 311 F. Supp. 3d at 363 (citing *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Babbitt*, 241 F.3d 722, 736–37 (9th Cir. 2001)) (internal quotation marks omitted); accord *Biodiversity Conservation Alliance v. U.S. Forest Service*, 765 F.3d 1264, 1275 (10th Cir. 2014) ("A substantial dispute can be found, for example, when other information in the record cast[s] substantial doubt on the adequacy of the agency's methodology and data." (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)); see, e.g., *Cave Creek*, 325 F.3d at 332 (no controversy where the petitioners "pointed to nothing casting serious doubt on [the agency's] preferred model"). An expert at Argonne labeled the Corps's analyses "scientifically unsound, inappropriate, and completely contrary to accepted professional practice," accusing the agency of conflating a cultural resource analysis with the very different visual resource analysis. Response from Robert Sullivan ¶ 1 (Jan. 10, 2017), J.A. 534. The Advisory Council voiced serious concerns about the photo simulations: "[T]here are flaws in the visual effects assessment. . . . [C]onsulting parties have repeatedly suggested that the Corps should require photographs and simulations from an adequate range of viewpoints . . . to illustrate the extent and magnitude of the effects." Letter from

Advisory Council Assistant Director 2 (Mar. 2, 2016), J.A. 1483. And the Park Service believed that the visual analyses “d[id] not meet [its] standards,” questioning whether the Corps and Dominion completed “an adequate visual analysis,” “evaluat[ed] . . . socioeconomic impacts,” and undertook a “sufficient cumulative effects analysis.” Letter from Park Service Associate Regional Director 1 (Mar. 25, 2016), J.A. 1357; Letter from Park Service Acting Regional Director 2 (Jan. 12, 2017), J.A. 476. If such comments, representing just a small sample of the many criticisms in the record, do not “cast substantial doubt on the adequacy” of the Corps’s methodologies, *Biodiversity Conservation Alliance*, 765 F.3d at 1275 (internal quotation marks omitted), then we are unsure what would.

According to the Conservation Groups, the controversy surrounding the Project is especially intense because many of those raising concerns—methodological and otherwise—are themselves government agencies with “special expertise” over historic resources. 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(a)(2). And as they also point out, courts regularly find that such concerns demonstrate that a project qualifies as highly controversial. *See, e.g., North American Wild Sheep*, 681 F.2d at 1182 (criticism from conservationists, biologists, two state agencies, and “other knowledgeable individuals” represented “precisely the type of ‘controversial’ action for which an EIS must be prepared”); *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 109 F. Supp. 2d 30, 43 (D.D.C. 2000) (project classified as “genuinely and extremely controversial” where three federal agencies, one state agency, and the public “all disputed the Corps evaluation”).

Again, the Conservation Groups are correct. The Advisory Council questioned the Corps’s “treatment of effects on historic properties of transcendent national significance.”

Letter from Advisory Council Director 1 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 411. Interior Secretary Jewell warned that the Project would “introduce a major intrusion into a landscape” like “no other preserved locale in the Nation.” Letter from Sally Jewell 1 (Jan. 17, 2016), J.A. 473. The Park Service worried that the Project “would forever degrade, damage, and destroy the historic setting of these iconic resources,” admonishing that “[t]his is not acceptable for resources designated by Congress to ensure their permanent protection.” Letter from Park Service Director 1 (Dec. 11, 2015), J.A. 1829. As the Service observed, “[s]ince the 1930s, the visitor experience and interpretation of Jamestown has been a collective effort . . . to shift [visitors’] sense of place back in time,” and “[w]ithin the Historic District the James River is unblemished by any man-made physical crossing.” Letter from Park Service Associate Regional Director 6 (July 5, 2016), J.A. 878; Letter from Park Service Associate Regional Director 3 (Jan. 29, 2016), J.A. 1494. The Service repeatedly communicated its concerns to the Corps, and its own management plan requires that the “visual and historical integrity of the visitor experience” be “maximize[d]” and that all new utility lines be installed underground. Management Plan at 19, 34.

And the list goes on. Industrial Economics, Inc., a consultant retained by the Park Service, feared that the Project could “have implications for successful future designation [of Jamestown] as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.” Industrial Economics, Inc. Report 9 (Jan. 2017), J.A. 499. The Virginia Department of Historic Resources warned of “irreparabl[e] alter[ation] [of] the character of the area.” Letter from Virginia Department of Historic Resources Director 2 (Nov. 13, 2015), J.A. 1855. Members of Congress, delegates to the Virginia Assembly, the Keeper of the National Historic Register, and the Council on Environmental Quality all voiced similar reservations. The non-profit Coalition to Protect America’s

National Parks, comprising current and former Park Service employees, pleaded, as did a bevy of other organizations, that “[t]he Corps owes . . . to this and future generations of Americans to protect the place where ‘America Began.’” Letter from Coalition to Protect America’s National Parks 1 (Dec. 23, 2016), J.A. 464.

These are hardly the hyperbolic cries of “highly agitated,” not-in-my-backyard neighbors “willing to go to court over the matter.” *Frizzell*, 530 F.2d at 988 n.15. Instead, they represent the considered responses—many solicited by the Corps itself—of highly specialized governmental agencies and organizations. The Advisory Council, tasked as it is with preserving America’s historic resources, merits special attention when it opines, as it did here, on “the treatment of effects on historic properties of transcendent national significance.” Letter from Advisory Council Director 1 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 411; *see also Preservation Coalition, Inc. v. Pierce*, 667 F.2d 851, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (“[J]udgments of historical significance made by the Advisory Council . . . deserve great weight.”). Of course, as lead agency the Corps owes no obligation to bend to the will of others. *See Citizens Against Burlington*, 938 F.2d at 201 (a lead agency must only “take [other agencies’ comments] seriously”). But repeated criticism from many agencies who serve as stewards of the exact resources at issue, not to mention consultants and organizations with on-point expertise, surely rises to more than mere passion.

The Corps argues that because the Park Service is a component of the Interior Department, Secretary Zinke’s letter approving the Project, in the district court’s words, “effectively withdrew” the Service’s “previous stance that an EIS was required.” *National Parks Conservation Association*, 311 F. Supp. 3d at 366. We disagree. For one thing, even if the Zinke letter did withdraw the Service’s opposition, numerous other

groups remained adamantly opposed. We are unsure, moreover, whether the Zinke letter actually responds to the Park Service's concerns. As the Conservation Association points out, the letter "never even reference[s] [the Park Service's] objections [or] longstanding methodological critiques." Conservation Association Reply Br. 10. And most important, the Zinke letter says little about the only question before us: whether the Corps acted arbitrarily and capriciously in declining to prepare an EIS. Regardless of Interior's stance, the Corps retained its NEPA obligation to "consider adequately" whether the Project is highly controversial. *Cave Creek*, 325 F.3d at 327. Because the facts underlying the Park Service's concerns changed not at all between the Jewell and Zinke letters, the Corps had to either confront those facts or explain why the Zinke letter rendered them irrelevant. *See Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro*, 136 S. Ct. 2117, 2125 (2016) ("One of the basic procedural requirements of administrative rulemaking is that an agency must give adequate reasons for its decisions."). Indeed, in our view, that two Interior Secretaries had diametrically different views about the same project on the same facts simply reinforces its controversial nature.

The Corps next contends that it did acknowledge and try to address concerns raised during the NEPA process by, for example, instructing Dominion to revise its analyses to address the shortcomings identified by commenters. But that misses the point. The question is not whether the Corps attempted to resolve the controversy, but whether it succeeded. Given that many critical comments, including those from the Advisory Council and the Argonne specialist, post-dated Dominion's revisions, the Corps obviously failed.

In short, the Corps's assessment of the scope of the Project's effects has drawn consistent and strenuous

opposition, often in the form of concrete objections to the Corps's analytical process and findings, from agencies entrusted with preserving historic resources and organizations with subject-matter expertise. This demonstrates the "something more" needed to show that "the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(4).

### **B.**

The next intensity factor the Conservation Groups cite examines the "[u]nique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(3). According to the Conservation Association, "[t]he Corps-approved project entails putting giant modern transmission towers not only in close 'proximity to' numerous highly unique historic and cultural sites that are 'one-of-a-kind resources of national importance,' but putting them directly *in and across the nation's only Congressionally-designated historic water trail.*" Conservation Association Br. 19 (emphasis in original) (citation omitted). The Corps responds that the Project "'is not a blockage to viewing the river or the surroundings' and 'will not dominate the view.'" Corps Br. 27 (quoting Memo § 10.3.8, J.A. 258). Again, the Corps misses the point.

Congress has consistently "recommit[ted] itself to protecting and restoring the James River for the enjoyment and prosperity of current and future generations." H.R. Res. 16 § 4. As one congressman put it, these efforts preserve "the opportunity [for visitors] to marvel at some of the same sites that Captain Smith and his crew beheld." 152 Cong. Rec. 22,283 (2006) (statement of Rep. Hoyer). Of course, when Captain Smith sailed up the James River in the seventeenth century, he beheld nothing either licensed by the U.S. Army

Corps of Engineers or built by Dominion Energy. In other words, even without blocking the view or dominating the landscape from all angles, the Project undercuts the very purpose for which Congress designated these resources: to preserve their “unspoiled and evocative landscape[s].” Letter from Advisory Council Chairman 1 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 414.

Insisting that the Project is nothing new, the Corps points to existing “modern visual intrusions” in the same region that represent a “successful mix of progress and history.” Corps Br. 28 (quoting Memo § 10.3.8, J.A. 257). This mischaracterizes the record. Although there is some modern development, including an amusement park, boat traffic, and resorts, the Corps itself described these as largely “low density intrusions that become relatively lost within the overall landscape.” National Register of Historic Places Eligibility 4 (May 7, 2015), J.A. 2205. As the Conservation Association observes, “the record does not support the assertion . . . that existing intrusions are remotely comparable in size, magnitude, or impact to this massive project that will be the *only* overhead crossing of the James River in a fifty-one-mile stretch.” Conservation Association Br. 20 (emphasis in original).

The Corps maintains that the mitigation steps contained in its Memorandum of Agreement with Dominion “would reduce [the Project’s] impacts to a minimum.” Corps Br. 42. But the relevance of the Memorandum is dubious given that the Corps declined to rely on it when making its “no significance” findings. To the extent the Corps leans on it now, the document offers little support. Except for requiring Dominion to “examine” alternative “coating and finishing materials” for the transmission towers, the enumerated mitigation measures the Corps cites relate not to reducing the significance of the Project’s visual impacts on the historic resources along the James River, but rather to periodic evaluation of the continued

need for the Project itself and to more general historic preservation efforts throughout the Commonwealth. Memorandum of Agreement § I.e.1, J.A. 293.

Finally, the Corps emphasizes that the Project's effects are visual and that the Seventh Circuit, citing our decision in *Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission v. U.S. Postal Service*, 487 F.2d 1029, 1038–39 (D.C. Cir. 1973), stated that aesthetic “judgments are inherently subjective and normally can be made . . . reliably on the basis of an environmental assessment.” *River Road Alliance, Inc. v. Corps of Engineers of U.S. Army*, 764 F.2d 445, 451 (7th Cir. 1985). But “normally” is not the same as “always.” And in *Maryland-National Capital Park*, we distinguished aesthetic judgment calls that entail “defining what is beautiful” from situations like this one where Congress's purpose in designating the resources was to preserve “an unencumbered view of an attractive scenic expanse.” 487 F.2d at 1038 & n.5.

### C.

The foregoing largely demonstrates why the Project implicates the final intensity factor invoked by the Conservation Groups: the “degree to which the action may adversely affect districts [or] sites . . . listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(8). Indeed, the Corps itself gets us much of the way there. It concedes that the Project's “close proximity” to Carter's Grove, an eighteenth-century Georgian-style plantation, “would detract from the resource's characteristics of setting and feeling which are integral to the resource's qualifications for listing on the [National Register of Historic Places].” Cultural Resources Effects Assessment § 3.9.4 (Sept. 15, 2015), J.A. 2024. And it is hardly just Carter's Grove. By the Corps's own count, the region boasts fifty-seven

sites on the National Register or eligible for inclusion on it—a concentration of historic resources found “[i]n no other place in [the] United States.” Letter from Park Service Regional Director 1 (Oct. 22, 2015), J.A. 1911.

The Corps’s findings, paired with the record’s “robust, well-supported analyses, from agencies with Congressionally-delegated authority and recognized expertise,” National Trust Br. 16, satisfy this intensity factor. The out-of-circuit cases cited by the Corps—concerning the construction of a golf clubhouse near another, historic one, *Presidio Golf Club v. National Park Service*, 155 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 1998), and the refurbishment of an existing railroad to provide commuter service, *Advocates for Transportation Alternatives, Inc. v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 453 F. Supp. 2d 289, 294–95 (D. Mass. 2006)—are easily distinguishable, as they implicate neither comparably sized infrastructure nor equally august historic resources.

#### D.

The Corps has thus failed to make a “convincing case” that an EIS is unnecessary. *Myersville Citizens*, 783 F.3d at 1322. Three intensity factors demonstrate not only that the Project will significantly impact historic resources, but also that it would benefit from an EIS. Indeed, Congress created the EIS process to provide robust information in situations precisely like this one, where, following an environmental assessment, the scope of a project’s impacts remains both uncertain and controversial. *See, e.g., Grand Canyon Trust*, 290 F.3d at 345–47 (remanding for further proceedings when an agency, analyzing noise impacts on a national park “identified [by the Park Service] as among the nine national parks of ‘highest priority,’” considered those impacts “in a vacuum” without sensitivity to the park’s “natural quiet”); *American Rivers*, 895

24

F.3d at 50 (ordering an EIS based on concerns that the agency “just shrugged off” potentially significant impacts based on “estimates entirely unmoored from any empirical, scientific, or otherwise verifiable study or source”).

### III.

In preparing its EIS, the Corps will have to revisit its theories about alternatives under NEPA, which in turn will require it to reevaluate its Clean Water Act and Preservation Act analyses. Accordingly, we see no reason to address most of the remaining questions raised by the Conservation Groups. *See American Iron & Steel Institute v. EPA*, 115 F.3d 979, 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (“see[ing] no profit” in addressing remaining argument where an agency was “already committed to agency revision”). Though taking no position on the adequacy of the Corps’s alternatives analyses, we urge it to give careful consideration to its sister agencies’ concerns that the prior iterations were “superficial,” “inadequate,” and “extremely problematic.” Letter from Advisory Council Chairman 3 (May 2, 2017), J.A. 416.

There is, however, one issue whose resolution would facilitate further proceedings before the Corps. Specifically, the parties disagree about the meaning of section 110(f) of the Preservation Act, which provides that for any project “directly and adversely affect[ing] any National Historic Landmark,” the agency must “to the maximum extent possible undertake such planning and actions as may be necessary to minimize harm to the landmark.” 54 U.S.C. § 306107. The debate centers on the word “directly” as it relates to Carter’s Grove, the National Historic Landmark at issue. According to the Corps and the district court, because the Project does not “physically” intrude on the plantation’s grounds—several towers are instead visible from them—section 110(f) does not apply. *See National Parks*

*Conservation Association*, 311 F. Supp. 3d at 379 (“The Court is persuaded that the meaning of ‘directly’ in Section 110(f) refers to physical impacts . . .”). The National Trust disagrees, equating “directly” with having “no intervening cause.” National Trust Br. 9 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Because we “owe no deference to [the Corps’s] interpretation of a statute it does not administer,” *Amax Land Co. v. Quarterman*, 181 F.3d 1356, 1368 (D.C. Cir. 1999), “[w]e begin our analysis with the language of the statute,” *United States v. Wilson*, 290 F.3d 347, 352 (D.C. Cir. 2002). Although section 110(f) clearly encompasses physical effects, nothing in the statute’s text so limits its reach. According to the dictionary, both now and at the time section 110(f) was passed, “direct” means “free from extraneous influence” or “immediate.” Black’s Law Dictionary (10th ed. 2014); *see also* Black’s Law Dictionary (5th ed. 1979) (“direct” defined as “without any . . . intervening influence” or “[i]mmmediate”). And had Congress wished to restrict section 110(f)’s reach to physical impacts, “it could have easily done so by using the word” physically. *Marx v. General Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S. 371, 384 (2013). Finally, although no agency has provided binding guidance, the two actually responsible for administering this statute—the Park Service, 54 U.S.C. § 306101(b), and the Advisory Council, *id.* § 304108(a)—both understand “directly” to “refer[] to causation and not physicality.” Letter from Advisory Council Assistant Director 4 (Mar. 2, 2016), J.A. 1485; *see also* Lawyers’ Committee for Cultural Heritage Preservation Br. 19, Ex. A, Letter from Park Service Acting Associate Director 2 (Sept. 21, 2017) (“The [Park Service] does not agree with the Corps’ position that Section 110(f) applies only when an undertaking may physically impact a National Historic Landmark.”). On remand, therefore, the Corps must reconsider its Preservation Act analysis using this proper definition.

26

**IV.**

For the foregoing reasons, we reverse and remand to the district court with instructions to vacate Dominion's permit and direct the Corps to prepare an environmental impact statement.

*So ordered.*