



US Army Corps
of Engineers®

REGULATORY GUIDANCE LETTER

No. 08-03

Date: 10 October 2008

SUBJECT: Minimum Monitoring Requirements for Compensatory Mitigation Projects Involving the Restoration, Establishment, and/or Enhancement of Aquatic Resources.

1. Purpose and Applicability

a. Purpose. This Regulatory Guidance Letter (RGL) provides the Districts and regulated public guidance on minimum monitoring requirements for compensatory mitigation projects, including the required minimum content for monitoring reports. This RGL replaces RGL 06-03.

b. Applicability. The final Mitigation Rule published on April 10, 2008, states that the submission of monitoring reports to assess the development and condition of compensatory mitigation projects is required, but the content and level of detail for those reports must be commensurate with the scale and scope of the compensatory mitigation projects as well as the compensatory mitigation project type (see 33 CFR 332.6(a)(1)).

This RGL applies to all Department of the Army (DA) permit authorizations under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act that contain special conditions requiring compensatory mitigation provided through aquatic resource restoration, establishment and/or enhancement. This guidance also applies to monitoring reports that are prepared for mitigation bank sites and in-lieu-fee project sites.

This RGL supports the Program Analysis and Review Tool (PART) program goals for the Regulatory Program. Specifically, this RGL supports the PART performance measures for mitigation site compliance and mitigation bank/ in-lieu-fee compliance. These measures apply to active mitigation sites, mitigation banks, and in-lieu-fee project sites that still require monitoring.

2. Background

Recent studies by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and National Research Council (NRC) indicated that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) was not providing adequate oversight to ensure that compensatory mitigation projects were successfully replacing the aquatic resource functions lost as a result of permitted activities. For example, the GAO study determined that many project files requiring

mitigation lacked monitoring reports despite the fact that such reports were required as a condition of the permit. Similarly, the NRC study documented that a lack of clearly stated objectives and performance standards in the approved compensatory mitigation proposals made it difficult to ascertain whether the goal of no net loss of wetland resources was achieved.

On April 10, 2008, the Corps and Environmental Protection Agency published the “Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources: Final Rule” (Mitigation Rule) which governs compensatory mitigation for activities authorized by permits issued by the Department of the Army (33 CFR Parts 325 and 332). This RGL complements and is consistent with the final Mitigation Rule.

3. Discussion

Inconsistent approaches to monitoring compensatory mitigation projects are one of several factors that have affected the ability of Corps project managers (PMs) to adequately assess achievement of the performance standards of Corps-approved mitigation plans. Standardized monitoring requirements will aid PMs when reviewing compensatory mitigation sites, thereby allowing the Corps to effectively assess the status and success of compensatory mitigation projects.

This RGL addresses the minimum information needed for monitoring reports that are used to evaluate compensatory mitigation sites. Monitoring requirements are typically based on the performance standards for a particular compensatory mitigation project and may vary from one project to another.

Monitoring reports are documents intended to provide the Corps with information to determine if a compensatory mitigation project site is successfully meeting its performance standards. Remediation and/or adaptive management used to correct deficiencies in compensatory mitigation project outcomes should be based on information provided in the monitoring reports and site inspections.

4. Guidance

a. Monitoring guidelines for compensatory mitigation.

i. Performance Standards. Performance standards, as defined in 33 CFR 332.2, and discussed in more detail at 33 CFR 332.5, will be consistent with the objectives of the compensatory mitigation project. These standards ensure that the compensatory mitigation project is objectively evaluated to determine if it is developing into the desired resource type and providing the expected functions. The objectives, performance standards, and monitoring requirements for compensatory mitigation projects required to offset unavoidable impacts to waters of the United States must be provided as special conditions of the DA permit or specified in the approved final mitigation plan (see 33 CFR 332.3(k)(2)). Performance standards may be based on functional, conditional, or other suitable assessment methods and/or criteria and may be incorporated into the

special conditions to determine if the site is achieving the desired functional capacity. Compensatory mitigation projects offset the impacts to diverse types of aquatic resources, including riverine and estuarine habitats. Special conditions of the DA permits will clearly state performance standards specific to the type and function of the ecosystem in relation to the objectives of the compensatory mitigation project.

ii. Monitoring Timeframe. The special conditions of the DA permit (or the mitigation plan as referenced in the special conditions) must specify the length of the monitoring period (see 33 CFR 332.6(a)(1)). For mitigation banks, the length of the monitoring period will be specified in either the DA permit, mitigation banking instrument, or approved mitigation plan. For in-lieu fee projects, the length of the monitoring period will be specified in either the DA permit or the approved in-lieu fee project plan.

The monitoring period must be sufficient to demonstrate that the compensatory mitigation project has met performance standards, but not less than five years (see 33 CFR 332.6(b)). The District determines how frequently monitoring reports are submitted, the monitoring period length, and report content. If a compensatory mitigation project has met its performance standards in less than five years, the monitoring period length can be reduced, if there are at least two consecutive monitoring reports that demonstrate that success. Permit conditions will support the specified monitoring requirement and include deadlines for monitoring report submittal. Longer monitoring timeframes are necessary for compensatory mitigation projects that take longer to develop (see 33 CFR 332.6(b)). For example, forested wetland restoration may take longer than five years to meet performance standards.

Annual monitoring and reporting to the Corps is appropriate for most types of compensatory mitigation projects, though the project sponsor may have to monitor progress more often during the project's early stages. Certain compensatory mitigation projects may require more frequent monitoring and reporting during the early stages of development to allow project managers to quickly address problems and/or concerns. Annual monitoring can resume once the project develops in accordance with the approved performance standards. In cases where monitoring is required for longer than five years, monitoring may be conducted on a less than annual timeframe (such as every other year), though yearly monitoring is recommended until the project becomes established as a successful mitigation project. In this case, off-year monitoring should include some form of screening assessment such as driving by the mitigation site, telephone conversations regarding condition of the mitigation site, etc. On-site conditions, the complexity of the approved mitigation plan, and unforeseen circumstances will ultimately determine whether the monitoring period should be extended beyond the specified monitoring time frame for a particular project. Complex and/or ecologically significant compensatory mitigation projects should have higher priority for site visits.

As discussed above, the remaining monitoring requirements may be waived upon a determination that the compensatory mitigation project has achieved its performance standards. The original monitoring period may be extended upon a determination that

performance standards have not been met or the compensatory mitigation project is not on track to meet them (e.g., high mortality rate of vegetation). Monitoring requirements may also be revised in cases where adaptive management or remediation is required.

iii. Monitoring Reports. Monitoring requirements, including the frequency for providing monitoring reports to the District Commander and the Interagency Review Team (IRT), will be determined on a case-by-case basis and specified in either the DA permit, mitigation banking instrument, or approved mitigation plan. The content of the monitoring reports will be specified in the special conditions of the DA permit so that the requirements are clearly identified for the permittee or third-party mitigation sponsor. In addition, the monitoring reports should comply with the timeframes specified in the special conditions of the DA permit. Monitoring reports will not be used as a substitute for on site compliance inspections. The monitoring report will provide the PM with sufficient information on the compensatory mitigation project to assess whether it is meeting performance standards, and to determine whether a compliance visit is warranted. The party responsible for monitoring can electronically submit the monitoring reports and photos for review.

Visits to mitigation sites will be documented in the administrative record and will count toward District performance goals. An enforcement action may be taken if the responsible party fails to submit complete and timely monitoring reports.

b. Contents of Monitoring Reports. Monitoring reports provide the PM with a convenient mechanism for assessing the status of required compensatory mitigation projects. The PM should schedule a site visit and determine potential remedial actions if problems with the compensatory mitigation project are identified in a monitoring report.

The submittal of large bulky reports that provide mostly general information should be discouraged. While often helpful as background, reiteration of the mitigation and monitoring plan content, lengthy discussions of site progress, and extensive paraphrasing of quantified data are unnecessary. Monitoring reports should be concise and effectively provide the information necessary to assess the status of the compensatory mitigation project. Reports should provide information necessary to describe the site conditions and whether the compensatory mitigation project is meeting its performance standards.

Monitoring reports will include a Monitoring Report Narrative that provides an overview of site conditions and functions. This Monitoring Report Narrative should be concise and generally less than 10 pages, but may be longer for compensatory mitigation projects with complex monitoring requirements. Monitoring Report Narratives may be posted on each District's Regulatory web site.

Monitoring reports will also include appropriate supporting data to assist District Commanders and other reviewers in determining how the compensatory mitigation project is progressing towards meeting its performance standards. Such supporting data may include plans (such as as-built plans), maps, and photographs to illustrate site

conditions, as well as the results of functional, condition, or other assessments used to provide quantitative or qualitative measures of the functions provided by the compensatory mitigation project site.

c. Monitoring Report Narrative:

i. Project Overview (1 page)

(1) Corps Permit Number or Name of the Mitigation Bank or In-Lieu Fee Project
(2) Name of party responsible for conducting the monitoring and the date(s) the inspection was conducted.

(3) A brief paragraph describing the purpose of the approved project, acreage and type of aquatic resources impacted, and mitigation acreage and type of aquatic resources authorized to compensate for the aquatic impacts.

(4) Written description of the location, any identifiable landmarks of the compensatory mitigation project including information to locate the site perimeter(s), and coordinates of the mitigation site (expressed as latitude, longitudes, UTM's, state plane coordinate system, etc.).

(5) Dates the compensatory mitigation project commenced and/or was completed.

(6) Short statement on whether the performance standards are being met.

(7) Dates of any recent corrective or maintenance activities conducted since the previous report submission.

(8) Specific recommendations for any additional corrective or remedial actions.

ii. Requirements (1 page)

List the monitoring requirements and performance standards, as specified in the approved mitigation plan, mitigation banking instrument, or special conditions of the DA permit, and evaluate whether the compensatory mitigation project site is successfully achieving the approved performance standards or trending towards success. A table is a recommended option for comparing the performance standards to the conditions and status of the developing mitigation site.

iii. Summary Data (maximum of 4 pages)

Summary data should be provided to substantiate the success and/or potential challenges associated with the compensatory mitigation project. Photo documentation may be provided to support the findings and recommendations referenced in the monitoring report and to assist the PM in assessing whether the compensatory mitigation project is meeting applicable performance standards for that monitoring period. Submitted photos should be formatted to print on a standard 8 ½" x 11" piece of paper, dated, and clearly labeled with the direction from which the photo was taken. The photo location points should also be identified on the appropriate maps.

iv. Maps and Plans (maximum of 3 pages)

Maps should be provided to show the location of the compensatory mitigation site relative to other landscape features, habitat types, locations of photographic reference points, transects, sampling data points, and/or other features pertinent to the mitigation plan. In addition, the submitted maps and plans should clearly delineate the mitigation site perimeter(s), which will assist PMs in locating the mitigation area(s) during subsequent site inspections. Each map or diagram should be formatted to print on a standard 8 1/2" x 11" piece of paper and include a legend and the location of any photos submitted for review. As-built plans may be included.

v. Conclusions (1 page)

A general statement should be included that describes the conditions of the compensatory mitigation project. If performance standards are not being met, a brief explanation of the difficulties and potential remedial actions proposed by the permittee or sponsor, including a timetable, should be provided. The District Commander will ultimately determine if the mitigation site is successful for a given monitoring period.


d. Completion of Compensatory Mitigation Requirements. For permittee-responsible mitigation projects, compensatory mitigation requirements will not be considered fulfilled until the permittee has received written concurrence from the District Commander that the compensatory mitigation project has met its objectives and no additional monitoring reports are required. PMs will review the final monitoring reports to make this determination. A final field visit should be conducted to verify that on-site conditions are consistent with information documented in the monitoring reports.

e. Special Condition. The following condition should be added to all DA permits that require permittee-responsible mitigation. This condition does not apply to mitigation banks or in-lieu-fee programs:

Your responsibility to complete the required compensatory mitigation as set forth in Special Condition X will not be considered fulfilled until you have demonstrated compensatory mitigation project success and have received written verification of that success from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

5. Duration

This guidance remains in effect unless revised or rescinded.



STEVEN L. STOCKTON, P.E.
Director of Civil Works