



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**

**United States Army Corps of Engineers
Regulatory Branch
Washington, D.C. 20314**

MEMORANDUM TO THE FIELD

Date: October 29, 2003

SUBJECT: Model "Operational Guidelines for Creating or Restoring Wetlands that are Ecologically Self-Sustaining" for Aquatic Resource Impacts Under the Corps Regulatory Program Pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

We are pleased, as part of the implementation of the National Wetlands Mitigation Action Plan, to enclose compensatory mitigation guidance. The guidance should serve as a technical support for permit applicants preparing compensatory mitigation plans to offset impacts to aquatic resources authorized under the Clean Water Act Section 404 and the Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 programs.

The purpose of the guidelines is to identify the basic requirements for mitigation success and assist in mitigation site selection. Please note that these guidelines also pertain to restoration or enhancement of other aquatic resource systems, such as streams.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark F. Sudol".

Mark F. Sudol, D. Env
Chief, Regulatory Branch
Operations Division
Directorate of Civil Works

Incorporating the National Research Council's Mitigation Guidelines Into the Clean Water Act Section 404 Program

BACKGROUND

In its comprehensive report entitled "*Compensating for Wetland Losses Under the Clean Water Act*," the National Research Council (NRC) provided ten guidelines to aid in planning and implementing successful mitigation projects ("Operational Guidelines for Creating or Restoring Wetlands that are Ecologically Self-Sustaining"; NRC, 2001). Please note that these guidelines also pertain to restoration and enhancement of other aquatic resource systems, such as streams. Each of the ten guidelines can generally be described as A) basic requirement for mitigation success, or B) guide for mitigation site selection. The following sections include both the original text of the NRC guidelines, in italics, as well as a discussion of how applicants and field staff can incorporate these guidelines into the development and review of mitigation projects.

A. **Basic Requirements for Success**

When considering mitigation sites it is important to note that wetland mitigation is not a precise, exact science and predictable results are not always obtainable. Having an adaptive management attitude is a necessity. One should incorporate experimentation into the mitigation plan when possible. This may mean using experimental plots within a mitigation site with different controls, replication, different treatments, inputs, etc., to determine if specific mitigation efforts are effectively meeting the desired goals. This requires detailed planning, effective implementation of the mitigation project, close monitoring (both short and long term) of the implemented plans and finally adjusting to intermediate results with an adaptive attitude and additional modifications to obtain long range wetland and watershed goals. In addition, researchers have found that restoration is the most likely type of mitigation to result in successful and sustainable aquatic resource replacement. Moreover, numerous studies in a variety of landscapes and watershed types have shown that of all factors contributing to mitigation success, attaining and maintaining appropriate hydrological conditions is the most important. The following NRC guidelines should be considered basic requirements for mitigation success.

A.1. **Whenever possible, choose wetland restoration over creation.**

Select sites where wetlands previously existed or where nearby wetlands still exist. Restoration of wetlands has been observed to be more feasible and sustainable than creation of wetlands. In restored sites the proper substrate may be present, seed sources may be on-site or nearby, and the appropriate hydrological conditions may exist or may be more easily restored.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Mitigation Memorandum of Agreement states that, "because the likelihood of success is greater and the impacts to potentially valuable uplands are reduced, restoration should be the first option considered" (Fed. Regist. 60(Nov. 28):58605). The Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER 1991a) recommends an emphasis on restoration first, then

enhancement, and, finally, creation as a last resort. Morgan and Roberts (1999) recommend encouraging the use of more restoration and less creation.

The applicant proposes the type of mitigation. However, the Corps and other agencies will evaluate proposals based on the ease of completion and the likelihood of success. Therefore, pure wetland creation will be evaluated using very stringent criteria before being approved for use as compensatory mitigation for project impacts. Some projects may include creation as part of an overall mitigation effort that involves restoration, enhancement, and/or preservation (e.g., as in a proposed mitigation bank). In these cases, evaluation will be based on the entire proposal and its location in the watershed.

A.2. Avoid over-engineered structures in the wetland's design

Design the system for minimal maintenance. Set initial conditions and let the system develop. Natural systems should be planned to accommodate biological systems. The system of plants, animals, microbes, substrate, and water flows should be developed for self-maintenance and self-design. Whenever possible, avoid manipulating wetland processes using approaches that require continual maintenance. Avoid hydraulic control structures and other engineered structures that are vulnerable to chronic failure and require maintenance and replacement. If necessary to design in structures, such as to prevent erosion until the wetland has developed soil stability, do so using natural features, such as large woody debris. Be aware that more specific habitat designs and planting will be required where rare and endangered species are among the specific restoration targets.

Whenever feasible, use natural recruitment sources for more resilient vegetation establishment. Some systems, especially estuarine wetlands, are rapidly colonized, and natural recruitment is often equivalent or superior to plantings (Dawe et al. 2000). Try to take advantage of native seed banks, and use soil and plant material salvage whenever possible. Consider planting mature plants as supplemental rather than required, with the decision depending on early results from natural recruitment and invasive species occurrence. Evaluate on-site and nearby seed banks to ascertain their viability and response to hydrological conditions. When plant introduction is necessary to promote soil stability and prevent invasive species, the vegetation selected must be appropriate to the site rather than forced to fit external pressures for an ancillary purpose (e.g., preferred wildlife food source or habitat).

The use of over-engineered structures and maintenance intensive plans for mitigation is not recommended and will be evaluated using very stringent criteria. If these types of plans are ultimately approved, they must include a comprehensive remedial plan and financial assurances [note that all mitigation projects should have remedial plans and financial assurances], along with a non-wasting endowment to insure that proper maintenance occurs.

It should also be noted that aggressive soil and planting plans using introduced plants and soil from outside sources must be closely monitored to prevent invasive plant takeovers and monotypic plant communities. Such failures can be minimized by undertaking both short-term and long-term monitoring, and having contingency plans in place.

A. 3. Restore or develop naturally variable hydrological conditions.

Promote naturally variable hydrology, with emphasis on enabling fluctuations in water flow and level, and duration and frequency of change, representative of other comparable wetlands in the same landscape setting. Preferably, natural hydrology should be allowed to become reestablished rather than finessed through active engineering devices to mimic a natural hydroperiod. When restoration is not an option, favor the use of passive devices that have a higher likelihood to sustain the desired hydroperiod over long term. Try to avoid designing a system dependent on water-control structures or other artificial infrastructure that must be maintained in perpetuity in order for wetland hydrology to meet the specified design. In situations where direct (in-kind) replacement is desired, candidate mitigation sites should have the same basic hydrological attributes as the impacted site.

Hydrology should be inspected during flood seasons and heavy rains, and the annual and extreme-event flooding histories of the site should be reviewed as closely as possible. For larger mitigation projects, a detailed hydrological study of the site should be undertaken, including a determination of the potential interaction of groundwater with the proposed wetland. Without flooding or saturated soils, for at least part of the growing season, a wetland will not develop. Similarly, a site that is too wet will not support the desired biodiversity. The tidal cycle and stages are important to the hydrology of coastal wetlands.

Natural hydrology is the most important factor in the development of successful mitigation. Wetlands and other waters are very dynamic, and dependent on natural seasonal and yearly variations that are unlikely to be sustainable in a controlled hydrologic environment. Artificial structures and mechanisms should be used only temporarily. Complex engineering and solely artificial mechanisms to maintain water flow normally will not be acceptable in a mitigation proposal. In those sites where an artificial water source (irrigation) has been used to attempt to simulate natural hydrology there are several problems that lead to reduced likelihood of success. First, artificial irrigation does not provide the dynamic and variable nature of water flow normally found in wetlands or riparian systems. Second, the lack of seasonal flows limits the transport of organic matter into and out of the wetland or riparian system. Without any inflow, the net result of artificial irrigation is transport of organic material out of the system. Third, depending on the timing, the use of flood or sprinkler systems on newly created or restoration sites often promotes the germination and growth of exotic plant species.

Note that this changes the Corps' past policy of accepting artificial irrigation as the sole source of hydrology for mitigation projects. If permitted at all, these projects will require substantial financial assurances and a higher mitigation ratio to offset their risk of failure. Applicants must weigh the potential investment costs of acquiring land suitable for restoration versus creation projects in upland environments that will likely involve higher long-term costs and greater risks of mitigation site failure.

The Corps may approve exceptions dealing with hydrologic manipulations, on a case-by-case basis in highly unusual circumstances. It should be noted, however, that even minor engineering or hydraulic manipulation requiring long-term maintenance will only be approved after the applicant posts a non-wasting endowment, performance bond, or other financial assurance.

A.4. Consider complications associated with creation or restoration in seriously degraded or disturbed sites

A seriously degraded wetland, surrounded by an extensively developed landscape, may achieve its maximal function only as an impaired system that requires active management to support natural processes and native species (NRC 1992). It should be recognized, however, that the functional performance of some degraded sites may be optimized by mitigation, and these considerations should be included if the goal of the mitigation is water- or sediment-quality improvement, promotion of rare or endangered species, or other objectives best served by locating a wetland in a disturbed landscape position. Disturbance that is intense, unnatural, or rare can promote extensive invasion by exotic species or at least delay the natural rates of redevelopment. Reintroducing natural hydrology with minimal excavation of soils often promotes alternative pathways of wetland development. It is often advantageous to preserve the integrity of native soils and to avoid deep grading of substrates that may destroy natural belowground processes and facilitate exotic species colonization (Zedler 1996).

When considering restoration options it is necessary to determine the spatial and temporal scale of the damage: is the damage limited to the water body itself, or is it a predominant characteristic of the watershed or the surrounding landscape? On-site damage may be restorable, whereas regional-scale damage may be more difficult, or impossible, to reverse or obtain historic conditions. Alternate goals may be necessary in order to determine specific goals of the restoration project. Those desired wetland mitigation goals will depend on the resources needed, the level of degradation and realistic mitigation targets as reflected by the watershed and surrounding landscape. This issue points to the importance of evaluating mitigation plans from a broader watershed perspective.

A.5. Conduct early monitoring as part of adaptive management

Develop a thorough monitoring plan as part of an adaptive management program that provides early indication of potential problems and direction for correction actions. The monitoring of wetland structure, processes, and function from the onset of wetland restoration or creation can indicate potential problems. Process monitoring (e.g., water-level fluctuations, sediment accretion and erosion, plant flowering, and bird nesting) is particularly important because it will likely identify the source of a problem and how it can be remedied. Monitoring and control of nonindigenous species should be a part of any effective adaptive management program. Assessment of wetland performance must be integrated with adaptive management. Both require understanding the processes that drive the structure and characteristics of a developing wetland. Simply documenting the structure (vegetation, sediments, fauna, and nutrients) will not provide the knowledge and guidance required to make adaptive “corrections” when adverse conditions are discovered. Although wetland development may take years to decades, process-based monitoring might provide more sensitive early indicators of whether a mitigation site is proceeding along an appropriate trajectory.

There are many factors that may positively or negatively influence aquatic resources and the functions they provide, such as urbanization, farming or grazing. Wetlands and other aquatic resources are often subject to a wide range and frequency of events such as floods, fires and ice storms. As with all natural systems, some things are beyond control. Well-crafted mitigation plans, however, recognize the likelihood of these events and attempt to plan for them, primarily through monitoring and adaptive

management. In addition, it is important to realize the mobile nature of wetlands and streams. They change over time and over the landscape in response to internal and external forces.

Monitoring and adaptive management should be used to evaluate and adjust maintenance (e.g., predator control, irrigation), and design remedial actions. Adaptive management should consider changes in ecological patterns and processes, including biodiversity of the mitigation project as it evolves or goes through successional stages. Trends in the surrounding area must also be taken into account (i.e., landscape/watershed context). Being proactive helps ensure the ultimate success of the mitigation, and improvement of the greater landscape. One proactive methodology is incorporation of experimentation into the mitigation plan when possible, such as using experimental plots within a mitigation site with different controls, replication, different treatments, inputs, etc., to determine if specific mitigation efforts are meeting the desired goals.

B. Mitigation Site Selection

The selection of an appropriate site to construct a mitigation project is one of the most important, yet often under-evaluated, aspects of mitigation planning. In many instances, the choice of the mitigation site has been completed by the applicant based solely on economic considerations with minimal concern for the underlying physical and ecological characteristics of the site. While economic factors are important in determining the practicability of site selection, current technology and the following NRC guidelines should also factor into the selection of a mitigation site.

B.1. Consider the hydrogeomorphic and ecological landscape and climate

Whenever possible, locate the mitigation site in a setting of comparable landscape position and hydrogeomorphic class. Do not generate atypical “hydrogeomorphic hybrids”; instead, duplicate the features of reference wetlands or enhance connectivity with natural upland landscape elements (Gwin et al. 1999).

Regulatory agency personnel should provide a landscape setting characterization of both the wetland to be developed and, using comparable descriptors, the proposed mitigation site. Consider conducting a cumulative impact analysis at the landscape level based on templates for wetland development (Bedford 1999). Landscapes have natural patterns that maximize the value and function of individual habitats. For example, isolated wetlands function in ways that are quite different from wetlands adjacent to rivers. A forested wetland island, created in an otherwise grassy or agricultural landscape, will support species that are different from those in a forested wetland in a large forest tract. For wildlife and fisheries enhancement, determine if the wetland site is along ecological corridors such as migratory flyways or spawning runs. Constraints also include landscape factors. Shoreline and coastal wetlands adjacent to heavy wave action have historically high erosion rates or highly erodible soils, and often-heavy boat wakes. Placement of wetlands in these locations may require shoreline armoring and other protective engineered structures that are contrary to the mitigation goals and at cross-purposes to the desired functions

Even though catastrophic events cannot be prevented, a fundamental factor in mitigation plan design should be how well the site will respond to natural disturbances that are likely to occur.

Floods, droughts, muskrats, geese, and storms are expected natural disturbances and should be accommodated in mitigation designs rather than feared. Natural ecosystems generally recover rapidly from natural disturbances to which they are adapted. The design should aim to restore a series of natural processes at the mitigation sites to ensure that resilience will have been achieved.

Watershed management requires thinking in terms of multiple spatial scales: the specific wetland or stream itself, the watershed that influences the wetland/stream, and the greater landscape. The landscape in which a wetland or water exists, defines its hydrogeologic setting. The hydrogeologic setting in turn controls surface and sub-surface flows of water, while a variety of hydrogeologic settings results in biological and functional diversity of aquatic resources.

There are three aspects of watershed management that the applicant must address in a mitigation plan: hydrogeomorphic considerations, the ecological landscape, and climate. It should be noted that the overall goal of compensatory mitigation is to replace the functions being lost (functional equivalency) due to a permitted Section 404 activity. By evaluating the hydrogeomorphic setting, ecological landscape and climate, one can determine which attributes can be manipulated (i.e. hydrology, topography, soil, vegetation or fauna) to restore, create or enhance viable aquatic functions.

Hydrogeomorphic considerations refers to the source of water and the geomorphic setting of the area. For example, a riverine wetland receives water from upstream sources in a linear manner, whereas vernal pools exist as relatively closed depressions underlain by an impermeable layer that allows rainfall runoff from a small watershed to fill the pool during specific times of year. Applicants should strive to replicate the hydrogeomorphic regime of the impacted water to increase the potential that the mitigation site mimics the functions lost. Only as a last resort, should applicants prepare plans for constructing wetlands using artificial water sources or placing wetlands into non-appropriate areas of the landscape. In such cases, there should be a contingency plan to prepare for unanticipated events or failures.

Ecological landscape describes the location and setting of the wetland/water in the surrounding landscape. For example, attempting to place mitigation in a dissimilar ecological complex than that of the impacted water is expected to result in a wetland/water unlikely to replicate the functions of the wetland/water that was lost. In all cases, the applicant should evaluate the historical ecological landscape of the mitigation site; for example, if there had been large areas of forested wetland in an agricultural area, then replacement of a forested wetland may be appropriate given other factors that should be considered. In most cases, applicants should plan for a mitigation area that fits best within the ecological landscape of the watershed or region of the mitigation site. Applicants should also consider constructing mitigation sites with more than one type of wetland/water regime, if appropriate, to provide for landscape diversity.

Climate also affects mitigation and is clearly beyond the control of the applicant. Therefore, the mitigation site should be sited in an area supported by the normal rainfall, subsurface and/or groundwater in the region. Climate considerations also can impact other hydrologic issues, sediment transport factors and other factors affecting attainment of desired functions. While climate cannot be manipulated, applicants need to account for it in mitigation plans, including local and regional variability and extremes.

B. 2. Adopt a dynamic landscape perspective

Consider both current and future watershed hydrology and wetland location. Take into account surrounding land use and future plans for the land. Select sites that are, and will continue to be, resistant to disturbance from the surrounding landscape, such as preserving large buffers and connectivity to other wetlands. Build on existing wetland and upland systems. If possible, locate the mitigation site to take advantage of refuges, buffers, green spaces, and other preserved elements of the landscape. Design a system that utilizes natural processes and energies, such as the potential energy of streams as natural subsidies to the system. Flooding rivers and tides transport great quantities of water, nutrients, and organic matter in relatively short time periods, subsidizing the wetlands open to these flows as well as the adjacent rivers, lakes, and estuaries.

Applicants should consider both current and expected future hydrology (including effects of any proposed manipulations), sediment transport, locations of water resources, and overall watershed functional goals before choosing a mitigation site. This is extremely critical in watersheds that are rapidly urbanizing; changing infiltration rates can modify runoff profiles substantially, with associated changes in sediment transport, flooding frequency, and water quality. More importantly, this factor encourages applicants to plan for long-term survival by placing mitigation in areas that will remain as open space and not be severely impacted by clearly predictable development. Consideration of the landscape perspective requires evaluation of buffers and connectivity (both hydrologic- and habitat-related). Buffers are particularly important to insure that changing conditions are ameliorated, especially in watersheds that have been, or are in the process of being, heavily developed. In addition, because wetlands are so dynamic, adequate buffers and open space upland areas are vital to allowing for wetlands to “breathe” (expand and/or decrease in size and function) and migrate within the landscape, particularly in watersheds under natural and/or man-made pressures.

B.3. Pay attention to subsurface conditions, including soil and sediment geochemistry and physics, groundwater quantity and quality, and infaunal communities.

Inspect and characterize the soils in some detail to determine their permeability, texture, and stratigraphy. Highly permeable soils are not likely to support a wetland unless water inflow rates or water tables are high. Characterize the general chemical structure and variability of soils, surface water, groundwater, and tides. Even if the wetland is being created or restored primarily for wildlife enhancement, chemicals in the soil and water may be significant, either for wetland productivity or bioaccumulation of toxic materials. At a minimum, these should include chemical attributes that control critical geochemical or biological processes, such as pH, redox, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus species), organic content and suspended matter.

Knowledge of the physical and chemical properties of the soil and water at the mitigation site is also critical to choice of location. For example, to mitigate for a saline wetland, without knowing the properties of the soil and water sources at the mitigation site, it is unlikely that such a wetland is restorable or creatable. Certain plants are capable of tolerating some chemicals and actually thrive in those environments, while others plants have low tolerances and quickly diminish when subjected to water containing certain chemicals, promoting monotypic plant communities. Planning for outside influences that may negatively affect the mitigation project can make a big difference as to the success of the mitigation efforts and meeting watershed objectives.

B.4 Pay particular attention to appropriate planting elevation, depth, soil type, and seasonal timing

When the introduction of species is necessary, select appropriate genotypes. Genetic differences within species can affect wetland restoration outcomes, as found by Seliskar (1995), who planted cordgrass (Spartina alterniflora) from Georgia, Delaware, and Massachusetts into a tidal wetland restoration site in Delaware. Different genotypes displayed differences in stem density, stem height, belowground biomass, rooting depth, decomposition rate, and carbohydrate allocation. Beneath the plantings, there were differences in edaphic chlorophyll and invertebrates.

Many sites are deemed compliant once the vegetation community becomes established. If a site is still being irrigated or recently stopped being irrigated, the vegetation might not survive. In other cases, plants that are dependent on surface-water input might not have developed deep root systems. When the surface-water input is stopped, the plants decline and eventually die, leaving the mitigation site in poor condition after the Corps has certified the project as compliant.

A successful mitigation plan needs to consider soil type and source, base elevation and water depth, plant adaptability and tolerances, and the timing of water input. When possible: a) use local plant stock already genetically adapted to the local environment; b) use stock known to be generally free from invasive or non-native species; c) use soil banks predetermined to have desirable seed sources; d) choose soil with desirable characteristics (e.g., high clay composition and low silt and sand

composition for compaction purposes); e) determine final bottom elevations to insure that targeted water regimes are met and the planned plant community can tolerate the water depth, frequency of inundation and quality of water sources.

It is particularly helpful to examine reference wetlands and/or waters near the mitigation area, in order to identify typical characteristics of sustainable waters in a particular watershed or region. This allows one to determine the likelihood of certain attributes developing in a proposed mitigation site. It should be emphasized that wetland restoration is much more likely to achieve desired results than wetland creation, as evidence of a previously existing wetland or other aquatic resource is a strong indicator of what will return, given the proper circumstances. Historical data for a particular site, if available, can also help establish management goals and monitoring objectives. Creating wetlands from uplands has proven to be difficult and often requires extensive maintenance.

B.5. Provide appropriately heterogeneous topography

The need to promote specific hydroperiods to support specific wetland plants and animals means that appropriate elevations and topographic variations must be present in restoration and creation sites. Slight differences in topography (e.g., micro- and meso-scale variations and presence and absence of drainage connections) can alter the timing, frequency, amplitude, and duration of inundation. In the case of some less-studied, restored wetland types, there is little scientific or technical information on natural microtopography (e.g., what causes strings

and flarks in patterned fens or how hummocks in fens control local nutrient dynamics and species assemblages and subsurface hydrology are poorly known). In all cases, but especially those with minimal scientific and technical background, the proposed development wetland or appropriate example(s) of the target wetland type should provide a model template for incorporating microtopography.

Plan for elevations that are appropriate to plant and animal communities that are reflected in adjacent or close-by natural systems. In tidal systems, be aware of local variations in tidal flooding regime (e.g., due to freshwater flow and local controls on circulation) that might affect flooding duration and frequency.

While manipulations of natural water supply may not be possible or desirable, changes in topography are possible and should be incorporated in the design of a restored or created wetland/water when needed. Varying the depths of the substrate of the mitigation area ensures a heterogeneous topography, decreasing the likelihood of homogenous plant communities. Rather than plan on one water level or one elevation of the substrate, in hopes of establishing a specific plant community, it is best to vary the depth of the bottom stratum. This will increase the likelihood of success for a more diverse targeted plant community and desired functions.