

The Virginia

Wetlands Report

Fall 2005
Vol. 20, No. 2



VMRC Adopts Wetland Mitigation/ Compensation Policy Changes

By Tom Barnard

When the Virginia Wetlands Act went into effect on July 1, thirty-three years ago, no one had ever heard of compensatory mitigation, wetland banking, in lieu fees, etc., now in common usage as wetland management tools. To the contrary, Virginia's new wetlands protection law instead contained a "grandfather clause" which declared that any project started prior to July 1, 1972 or any project for which a plan had been filed with an appropriate agency prior to that date, was exempt from the wetlands act and could be completed as planned. In recording the results of his Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) Masters Thesis, Clay Jones reported that 47% of the wetlands lost in the first two years under the wetlands act were due to the grandfather clause. In 1992 a sunset clause was enacted that removed the exemption after allowing a year during which every shoreline property owner, who thought his project qualified, could have it evaluated and declared exempt by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC).

The VMRC's Wetlands Mitigation-Compensation Policy and Supplemental Guidelines (4VAC 20-390-10 ET SEQ.) is a promulgated regulation approved by the Commission May 24, 2005. The effective date of the policy is July 1, 2005. The current policy is a revision of the original guidance and has been in place since first adopted in 1989. The revisions emphasize the need to require compensation for all tidal wetlands losses in order to achieve "no-net loss

of existing wetlands acreage and function."

The policy, most of which has not been affected by the revision process, was state of the art at the time and combined a two-tiered approach wherein the project first had to be shown to be water dependent and in the public interest. Additionally, the permittee was required to avoid the wetlands to the

The VIMS database clearly shows that the wetlands are being lost in relatively small quantities measured in square feet, which mount up to wetland losses over time measured not in square feet but in acres.

maximum extent possible, then minimize the loss and mitigate only the unavoidable wetland encroachment (Specific Criteria). This approach was taken for two reasons. First the Wetlands Act emphasizes the importance of wetlands "in their natural state" and second, scientific studies at the time had shown wetland creation and restoration, as mitigation, had a very poor success record. Therefore the policy placed its emphasis on maintaining the natural wetlands and only requiring or attempting compensatory mitigation as a last resort. Even though it is generally agreed among wetland scientists today that tidal wetlands can be created or

restored successfully by knowledgeable personnel, the "avoid and minimize first" philosophical approach has not been changed by the latest Commission revisions and remains in full force today.

The second tier of the original policy (Supplemental Guidelines) contains a series of specific recommended steps to be used when compensatory mitigation is required. They are included as the second tier in order to increase the probability of successfully establishing compensation wetlands by addressing the marsh creation shortcomings disclosed by previous scientific studies. The guidelines recommend, for example, that any compensatory mitigation project start with a detailed plan showing both the spatial and temporal approach to the project. The requirement of a performance bond is also strongly recommended along with a preference for 'in-kind and on-site' wetland creation. It is in these supplemental guidelines that the newly adopted revisions have been made.

When the Commonwealth became a signatory to the multi-state/federal Chesapeake Bay Program in 2000, it also signed onto the program's goal of achieving "...a no net loss of existing wetlands acreage and function within the signatories' regulatory programs." This goal is thus an integral part of the plan for restoration of the Bay. In the mean time, the VIMS wetland permit database tracking the permitted losses of tidal wetlands since 1993, has demonstrated that Virginia is not coming

close to its “no net loss” goal. Since 1993, the loss of 192 acres of wetlands has been permitted by local wetlands boards and the VMRC with only 20.3 acres of wetland replacement required. Most of these losses have occurred as a result of riprap revetments, bulkheads, and general wetland fills, in declining order of importance. The VIMS database clearly shows that the wetlands are being lost in relatively small quantities measured in square feet, which mount up to wetland losses over time measured not in square feet but in acres.

The Virginia Wetlands Report is a quarterly publication of the Wetlands Program at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science of the College of William and Mary. Subscriptions are available without charge upon written request to: Wetlands Program, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, P.O. Box 1346, Gloucester Pt, VA 23062 USA. Address corrections requested.

Program Director:
 Dr. Carl Hershner
 Head, Wetlands Advisory Program:
 David O'Brien
 Produced by:
 VIMS Publication Center

In this Issue:

VMRC Adopts Wetland Mitigation/ Compensation Policy Changes 1

Special Report--

Recommendations for Implementing the Tidal Wetlands Mitigation- Compensation Policy 3

Calendar of Upcoming Events 8

This report was funded, in part, by the Virginia Institute of Marine Science and by the Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program of the Department of Environmental Quality through Grant #NA03NOS4190104 - Task #11 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resources Management, under the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended.



The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NOAA or any of its subagencies or DEQ.

Printed on recycled paper

Virginia is committed to the goal of no-net loss as partner in the Chesapeake Bay Program. The specific revision intended to achieve the goal of no-net loss was the elimination of the threshold of 1000 square feet for non-commercial projects. Previously, the Supplemental Guidelines of the policy had exempted small wetland losses of a thousand square feet or less in favor of strictly enforcing the “avoidance of wetlands” mandate from the Specific Criteria section of the document. This exemption has been dropped from the revised guidance. Since all wetland losses must now be compensated, the old recommendation that all commercial projects involving wetlands losses be compensated has been eliminated as redundant. Under this revised policy, the proponent of any activity approved by the Commission or a wetlands board that involves tidal wetland losses, may satisfy his compensatory mitigation requirement in one of three ways:

1. Restore a similar wetland on the same site with a minimum 1 for 1 areal coverage.
2. Purchase wetland credits from an approved tidal wetland bank (provided the site is within the bank’s approved service area). There are presently two approved tidal wetland banks in Virginia, one in King and Queen County and one in the City of Chesapeake. The advent of these revised guidelines may encourage the creation of more tidal banks

within the Virginia portion of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

3. Arrange for the payment of an *in lieu* fee that is agreeable to the regulatory body, issuing the permit. The fee accounts will be set up by the Commission and local wetlands boards and the monies collected used for wetland compensation.

There always remains the preferred option of avoiding the wetlands entirely (favored by the present policy) if the permittee wishes to minimize any additional expense due to compensation requirements.

If the present policy is closely adhered to by the Commission and local wetland boards, Virginia will stand to achieve the goal of no-net loss for tidal wetlands.

The VMRC promulgated *Wetlands Guidelines*, developed by VIMS in 1974. In 1982, non-vegetated wetlands (including tidal flats, beaches, intertidal oyster reefs, etc.) were also placed under the protection of the state law and the *Wetlands Guidelines* were revised in 1983 to address the addition of these wetland communities. As the Wetlands Act has continued to evolve over the years, it has become a more significant piece of state environmental management law. This is evidenced by the Corps of Engineers’ reduction of the federal presence in shoreline permit application decision-making through the institution of general permits issued contingent on receiving a local wetland board or VMRC permit.



Tidal wetland creation at Paradise Creek in Portsmouth, VA. (Photo by W.I. Priest, III)

--SPECIAL REPORT--

Recommendations for Implementing the Tidal Wetlands Mitigation-Compensation Policy

No-net-loss can be difficult to achieve when long standing practice has been to accept small losses as a matter of routine. The Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) recently promulgated a Mitigation-Compensation policy that seeks to change this practice. Wetlands boards are now confronted with the need to finally achieve the no-net-loss goal that has been espoused at the state and federal levels of government for years. Implementation of the new policy is raising lots of questions. In response, the Center for Coastal Resources Management (CCRM) at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science offers the following recommendations for the decisions confronted in implementing the policy.

Tidal wetlands under the purview of local wetlands boards and the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) include both vegetated and non-vegetated wetlands. The guidelines promulgated by VMRC specifically identify the types of tidal wetlands found in Virginia and rank them in terms of overall ecological value. Both vegetated and non-vegetated wetlands are considered valuable, with non-vegetated wetlands performing a number of important

functions. While this information was developed over 30 years ago, it is still scientifically defensible and it remains useful for current decision-making. **We recommend that VMRC and wetlands boards consider both vegetated and non-vegetated wetlands in implementing the no-net-loss policy.**

Sequencing

The guidance for regulation of wetland losses contained in the law and promulgated by VMRC calls for strict adherence to the “sequencing” protocol. Under this approach, the first and highest priority in regulatory decisions is to avoid resource losses whenever possible. In general, wetlands are permanently lost from the aquatic ecosystem when they are filled to create upland. Redesigning projects to avoid fill is a management strategy that has been frequently ignored in an effort to accommodate property owner desires, minimize project costs, and reduce needs for regulatory oversight. **We strongly recommend avoidance as the simplest and most assured means of achieving no-net-loss.** (See diagrams on page 4 - wetland loss through fill.)

While avoidance of fill is the first and most practical way to achieve no-

net-loss, simply moving proposed shoreline structures landward to get out of jurisdictional wetlands is not always an optimal strategy from an environmental perspective. Our understanding of processes along shorelines has advanced, and we now recognize there are times when loss of the riparian buffer can be as detrimental to the overall system as loss of intertidal wetlands. CCRM is currently developing guidance to identify these circumstances and help make appropriate decisions from the ecosystem perspective.

Avoidance of wetland loss can and should involve much more than simple relocation of project elements. The first question should always be “Is the project necessary?” Too often this question is simply bypassed, and the option of avoiding loss of wetlands by not constructing the project is never really considered. Inappropriate and unnecessary structures are evident along many shorelines in Virginia. Permitting such projects makes achieving no-net-loss much more difficult. (See unavoidable fill decision tree on the bottom of page 5.)

Minimizing wetland losses associated with necessary projects has generally been part of wetland board discussions. Unfortunately, most boards have operated with the understanding that some minor losses were acceptable. The cumulative result has been a slow but constant loss of wetland resources. VMRC’s no-net-loss policy now directs boards to require compensation for even these small losses. The universal question is how should this be accomplished.

CCRM recommends three options: 1 - on-site compensation (i.e. establishment of a private wetlands bank); 2 - offsite compensation or use of a commercial wetlands bank; or 3 - collection of a fee that the locality will use to offset cumulative wetland losses from a number of projects.

CCRM Recommendations

- Impacts to both vegetated and non-vegetated wetlands should be considered
- Avoidance of impacts should be the primary objective
- Compensation ratios generally need to be greater than 1:1
- Onsite compensation should be treated like creation of a private wetlands bank
- Monitoring of compensation sites should extend for at least 10 years
- In-lieu fees should be set at approximately 5 times the cost of an acre of undeveloped riparian land for every acre of wetlands filled
- Properly designed and sited “living shoreline” projects should require no compensation

On-site compensation

A common strategy in compensation for wetland losses has been the requirement for an applicant to create equivalent wetlands on the project site or nearby. It is the opinion of the CCRM scientists who have worked with this option over the past 30 years that it has generally not succeeded in generating significant compensation. There are many reasons why this is the case, but basically they all result in a very low probability that the compensatory wetlands will achieve a sustainable level of function. In view of this circumstance, *we believe wetlands boards should generally require compensation at a ratio of greater than 1 acre of created wetlands for each acre of filled wetlands* (see shaded box on page 6).

In addition, to reduce the risk that wetlands created on-site will fail without proper design and monitoring, *we recommend that wetland boards treat every proposal to replace wetlands onsite or nearby just like the creation of a private wetlands bank* (see shaded box on page 6). At a minimum this should involve a requirement for long-term monitoring and reporting. *We strongly recommend requiring monitoring to ensure success for a period of at least 10 years.*

Offsite Compensation and Wetland Banks



Offsite compensation involves creating a replacement wetland on another piece of property that may or may not have similar characteristics to the filled site. Commercial wetland banks are

wetlands created specifically in anticipation of selling the compensation “credits” they represent. Some wetland banks are already in existence, although they are not available for use in all areas. There are explicit guidance and requirements for establishment and operation of these banks, and once established they afford a project applicant and a wetlands board a relatively certain success in replacing lost wetlands. However, it is important for boards to remember that 1000 square feet of natural marsh along a shoreline cannot always be replaced by 1000 square feet of created marsh in a wetland bank. Wetland functions are affected by the surrounding landscape and so achieving no-net-loss of function can require a greater than 1:1 ratio of created to filled wetlands. The VMRC and CCRM have had guidance for this evaluation available for some time.

CCRM recommends that wetland boards use this guidance to establish the compensation ratio requirement whenever a project will use either off-site compensation or a commercial wetland bank to achieve no-net-loss.

In-lieu fees

It is likely that the most useful strategy for wetland boards will be establishment of a fee structure that allows applicants to compensate for unavoidable loss of wetlands by paying into a fund. The concept of “in-lieu” fees has been around for some time. There are both advantages and disadvantages to their use, but they are a practical means for addressing multiple small losses. The biggest challenge for a well-intentioned board is to establish the fees at a level sufficient to fund projects that will provide significant and ultimately equivalent ecological values. Because the rate at which fees may be accumulated will vary widely, and because project designs and costs may also vary widely, there is no set formula for determining the appropriate fee structure. *We recommend that localities using in-lieu fees establish the rate at approximately 5 times the cost of an acre of undeveloped riparian land for every acre of wetlands filled.* (See shaded box on page 7).



Summary of Key Mitigation-Compensation Policy Elements:

A. Three criteria must be met for authorization of an activity which destroys wetlands:

1. All reasonable mitigative actions, including alternate siting, which would eliminate or minimize wetlands loss or disturbance, must be incorporated into the proposal.
2. The proposal must clearly be water-dependent in nature.
3. The proposal must demonstrate clearly its need to be in the wetlands.

B. There are three compensation options for unavoidable wetlands loss. The sequence of the options should be as follows:


1. On-site,
2. Off-site within the same watershed or mitigation bank in the watershed,
3. Payment of an in-lieu fee.

The policy specifies details for consideration in the use of the various approaches. For on-site and off-site compensation (wetlands creation) these include:

- A detailed plan
- Pre-planting elevation inspection
- Performance bond
- Appropriate replacement ratio
- Compensation in advance, or concurrent with, approved activity
- Siting in a non-aquatic community
- Nonvegetated wetlands should be treated on an equal basis
- Monitoring
- Perpetual easement over compensation area.

The Commission's Guidelines for the Establishment, Use and Operation of Tidal Wetland Mitigation Banks in Virginia details the requirement for the mitigation banking option. Unless otherwise demonstrated, the mitigation bank must be located in the same U.S.G.S cataloging unit or adjacent unit in the same watershed as the authorized activity to be acceptable compensation.

The use of in-lieu fees as the final option requires demonstration that on-site or off-site compensation is not practical and no mitigation bank is located in the project watershed. The fee amount should be no less than the cost of compensation acreage or purchase of approved bank credits. Fees collected should be traced to the eventual use in wetland restoration or creation projects.



The amount of wetlands it takes to replace lost wetlands should consider:

- The degree to which created wetlands can perform the same functions as the lost wetlands;
- The probability that created wetlands will be successfully established and sustained; and
- The length of time it will take created wetlands to reach their maximum level of function.

In general, created wetlands cannot fully match the performance of natural wetlands for many years, if ever. This is due in part to the time required to develop the biogeochemical conditions found in natural wetland soils. At best this can take several years, more typically it requires decades. Additionally, wetland creation is often not completely successful because of the difficulty in fully replicating natural hydrologic conditions, and the challenge of controlling invasive or less desirable plant and animal species. The result can be significant reductions, for significant periods, in functions such as habitat services and water quality modification.

The most direct way to compensate for these temporary and/or permanent reductions in services is to create more than one acre of wetlands for every acre of wetlands lost. Assuming a relatively high probability of success in establishing created wetlands, and allowing 3 to 5 years to achieve maximum performance potential, most projects would require compensation ratios around 1.5 created acres for every 1 acre lost.

CCRM is developing guidance to assist wetlands boards in estimation of appropriate compensation ratios. In the interim we recommend boards strive for greater than 1:1 compensation whenever possible.

If on-site compensatory mitigation is proposed, the following criteria, as outlined in the *Guidelines for the Establishment, Use, and Operation of Tidal Wetland Mitigation Banks in Virginia* (<http://www.mrc.virginia.gov/regulations/bankguide.shtm>); developed jointly by VMRC and VIMS), are recommended for planning and monitoring of the mitigation site in order to increase the likelihood of success.

Planning Requirements

When considering approval of on-site mitigation, local wetlands boards and VMRC should request a prospectus from the applicant that includes information on the objectives for the site and how it will be established and monitored, and should include the following:

- a. Site goals and objectives;
- b. Ownership or other legally responsible party;
- c. Mitigation site size and wetland community type(s), as defined by the Commission's Wetlands Guidelines, including baseline conditions, site plan and specifications;
- d. Reporting protocols and monitoring plan;
- e. Contingency and remedial actions and responsibilities;
- f. Financial assurances to include a performance bond or letter of credit to remain until the wetland has become established according to the established success criteria;
- g. Provisions for long-term management and maintenance, including the establishment of a protective easement for the mitigation site

Success Criteria

Local wetlands boards and VMRC should use the following performance standards to determine the level of success of on-site tidal mitigation:

- a. A mitigation plan including specific marsh design and final elevation plans.
- b. Establishment and verification of proper tidal hydrology and substrate elevations relative to on-site tidal datum and satisfactory planting of mitigation site with proper wetland vegetation which clearly demonstrates an initiation of the wetland community type(s) specified in the mitigation plan.
- c. Minimum of 80% survival of plantings after the first growing season. If plant mortalities exceed 20%, the sponsor will have to replace those plantings or implement other remedial actions specified in the mitigation plan.
- d. Minimum 50% plant cover after one growing season.
- e. Natural increase in the accumulation of organics in the site substrate.
- f. Natural recruitment of plant species within the site.
- g. Increasing primary production during the first three years.
- h. Utilization by typical primary and secondary consumers.
- i. Utilization by higher consumers (birds, mammals, fish, etc.).

Living Shorelines

One of the most recent trends in shoreline management has involved installation of “living shorelines.” This practice uses intertidal marshes combined with low-profile riprap revetments on the water-side of the marsh to stabilize shorelines and minimize erosion risks. There are numerous advantages to these structures when compared to traditional bulkheads or rock revetments. They are not suited to all shoreline environments, but where wave energies are low to moderate they should be considered.

Properly designed living shoreline projects may involve fill or conversion of some wetland areas. The low profile riprap revetment will generally cover non-vegetated wetlands or subaqueous lands. If a marsh must also be created, an even greater intertidal or subaqueous area could be converted. The issue that arises for a wetlands board is how to deal with the impacts associated with construction of a living shoreline. It is our opinion that in a properly designed and sited living shoreline project, the conversion of wetlands is beneficial.

CCRM is developing guidance to assist wetlands boards in making this assessment of proposed projects. For projects that are deemed appropriate, *we recom-*

mend that wetlands boards require no compensation for properly designed and sited living shoreline projects.


An in-lieu fee system operates by accepting money in place of actual construction of compensation. The rationale is that accumulation of fees from many individual projects to fund fewer large compensation projects is likely to produce more significant and more successful compensation.

Operation of a successful in-lieu fee program involves administrative costs, land acquisition costs, site improvement costs, and monitoring costs. Typically, compensation projects are not undertaken until sufficient funds have been accumulated. This results in an interval between fee collection and use during which project costs usually escalate. As a consequence of these factors, it is important that in-lieu fees be established at a high enough rate to ensure they can realistically fund future compensation. Generally this will be significantly higher than the cost of land alone.

A recent estimate of potential costs in the urban area of southeastern Virginia, resulted in a recommended fee of \$51.32 per square foot of lost wetlands. This was based on administrative costs and site development costs in an area where riparian land values currently approach \$1,500,000 per acre. In other areas of more moderate land values, we have recommended that fees be set at approximately 5 times the value of undeveloped riparian land.

As an example, if land costs are \$100,000 per acre, our recommendation would result in fees of about \$11.48 per square foot. At this rate, the total in-lieu of fee for a wetland loss of 1000 square feet would amount to \$11,480.

Typical Living Shoreline Treatment



Elevations & planting widths will vary depending on site conditions.
Extent of channelward encroachment depends on extent of landward design.

Calendar of Upcoming Events

- Dec. 5-7, 2005 Environmental Results Using Market-Based Approaches. Atlantic City, NJ.**
Sponsored by EPA, this conference seeks to examine market-based environmental tools currently in use in various media. Participants will gain an understanding of the methods and the science behind them, and the legal considerations, limitations and drivers for each. Abstracts due by May 31, 2005.
seligman.andrew@epa.gov
- March 10, 2006 VIMS Tidal Wetlands Workshop. Gloucester Pt., Virginia.**
Topics: Integrated Guidance, Compensation, and Living Shorelines.
Contact Dawn Fleming, CCRM, (804) 684-7380 or email dawnf@vims.edu.
- May 14-17, 2006 The Coastal Society, St. Pete Beach, Florida.**
Charting a New Course; Shaping Solutions for the Coast – Focus is on exploring solutions and the interface among scientists, policy-makers, coastal managers, and the public. Contact Judy Tucker, The Coastal Society, P.O. Box 25408, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-5408, Phone: (703) 768-1599, Fax: (703) 768-1598, email coastalsoc@aol.com, www.thecoastalsociety.org/conference/TCS20/index.html
- July 9-14, 2006 Society of Wetlands Scientists, Cairns, Queensland, Australia.**
Catchments to Coast is an international conference, the major focus will be the vital role and value of wetlands within the terrestrial and marine environments.
Contact Sally Brown, PO Box 108, Kenmore QLD 4069, Australia, Phone: +61 7 3201 2808, Fax: +61 7 3201 2809, Email: sally.brown@uq.net.au, http://www.catchments.org.au/

Living Shorelines

A Natural Approach to Erosion Control For Low to Moderate Energy Shorelines

- ☞ Create & restore natural erosion buffers, such as beaches, marshes & riparian forests
- ☞ Improve water quality
- ☞ Reduce sediment runoff & suspension
- ☞ Enhance shoreline habitats & spawning areas
- ☞ Gain aesthetic & property value benefits



Planted shoreline.



Graded embankment and planted marsh.

