

### Federal Policy: Monitoring & Performance Standards

#### 2008 Compensatory Mitigation Regulations

##### §332.2 Definitions

*Functional capacity* means the degree to which an area of aquatic resource performs a specific function.

*Functions* means the physical, chemical, and biological processes that occur in ecosystems.

*Performance standards* are observable or measurable physical (including hydrological), chemical and/or biological attributes that are used to determine if a compensatory mitigation project meets its objectives.

##### § 332.5 Ecological performance standards.

(a) The approved mitigation plan must contain performance standards that will be used to assess whether the project is achieving its objectives. Performance standards should relate to the objectives of the compensatory mitigation project, so that the project can be objectively evaluated to determine if it is developing into the desired resource type, providing the expected functions, and attaining any other applicable metrics (e.g., acres).

(b) Performance standards must be based on attributes that are objective and verifiable. Ecological performance standards must be based on the best available science that can be measured or assessed in a practicable manner. Performance standards may be based on variables or measures of functional capacity described in functional assessment methodologies, measurements of hydrology or other aquatic resource characteristics, and/or comparisons to reference aquatic resources of similar type and landscape position. The use of reference aquatic resources to establish performance standards will help ensure that those performance standards are reasonably achievable, by reflecting the range of variability exhibited by the regional class of aquatic resources as a result of natural processes and anthropogenic disturbances. Performance standards based on measurements of hydrology should take into consideration the hydrologic variability exhibited by reference aquatic resources, especially wetlands. Where practicable, performance standards should take into account the expected stages of the aquatic resource development process, in order to allow early identification of potential problems and appropriate adaptive management.

### § 332.6 Monitoring.

#### (a) *General.*

(1) Monitoring the compensatory mitigation project site is necessary to determine if the project is meeting its performance standards, and to determine if measures are necessary to ensure that the compensatory mitigation project is accomplishing its objectives. The submission of monitoring reports to assess the development and condition of the compensatory mitigation project is required, but the content and level of detail for those monitoring reports must be commensurate with the scale and scope of the compensatory mitigation project, as well as the compensatory mitigation project type. The mitigation plan must address the monitoring requirements for the compensatory mitigation project, including the parameters to be monitored, the length of the monitoring period, the party responsible for conducting the monitoring, the frequency for submitting monitoring reports to the district engineer, and the party responsible for submitting those monitoring reports to the district engineer.

(2) The district engineer may conduct site inspections on a regular basis (e.g., annually) during the monitoring period to evaluate mitigation site performance.

(b) *Monitoring period.* The mitigation plan must provide for a monitoring period that is sufficient to demonstrate that the compensatory mitigation project has met performance standards, but not less than five years. A longer monitoring period must be required for aquatic resources with slow development rates (e.g., forested wetlands, bogs). Following project implementation, the district engineer may reduce or waive the remaining monitoring requirements upon a determination that the compensatory mitigation project has achieved its performance standards. Conversely the district engineer may extend the original monitoring period upon a determination that performance standards have not been met or the compensatory mitigation project is not on track to meet them. The district engineer may also revise monitoring requirements when remediation and/or adaptive management is required.

#### (c) *Monitoring reports.*

(1) The district engineer must determine the information to be included in monitoring reports. This information must be sufficient for the district engineer to determine how the compensatory mitigation project is progressing towards meeting its performance standards, and may include plans (such as as-built plans), maps, and photographs to illustrate site conditions. Monitoring reports may also include 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.

(2) The permittee or sponsor is responsible for submitting monitoring reports in accordance with the special conditions of the DA permit or the terms of the instrument. Failure to submit monitoring reports in a timely manner may result in compliance action by the district engineer.

(3) Monitoring reports must be provided by the district engineer to interested federal, tribal, state, and local resource agencies, and the public, upon request.

### **§332.8 Mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs**

(q) *Reporting.*

(2) *Monitoring reports.* The sponsor is responsible for monitoring the mitigation bank site or the in-lieu fee project site in accordance with the approved monitoring requirements to determine the level of success and identify problems requiring remedial action or adaptive management measures. Monitoring must be conducted in accordance with the requirements in § 332.6, and at time intervals appropriate for the particular project type and until such time that the district engineer, in consultation with the IRT, has determined that the performance standards have been attained. The instrument must include requirements for periodic monitoring reports to be submitted to the district engineer, who will provide copies to other IRT members.

### Resources: Monitoring & Performance Standards

Chicago District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. June 2008. "Appendix B: Performance and Monitoring Standards." In: "Interagency coordination agreement on mitigation banking within the regulatory boundaries of Chicago District, Corps of Engineers." pp. 25-28. <http://www.lrc.usace.army.mil/co-r/MBICAJun2008.pdf>.

Environmental Law Institute. April 2004. "Measuring Mitigation: A Review of the Science for Compensatory Mitigation Performance Standards." [http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/pdf/ELI\\_Measuring\\_Mitigation.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/pdf/ELI_Measuring_Mitigation.pdf)

Faber-Langendoen, Don, et. al. November 2008. "Ecological Performance Standards for Wetland Mitigation: An Approach Based on Ecological Integrity Assessments." NatureServe. [http://www.natureserve.org/publications/EPA-EcolStdnds-WetlandMitigation\\_MainReport.pdf](http://www.natureserve.org/publications/EPA-EcolStdnds-WetlandMitigation_MainReport.pdf)

Los Angeles District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. [Anticipated 2012.] "Mitigation Monitoring Guidelines." <http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/regulatory/>

Norfolk District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. "Recommendations for Wetland Compensatory Mitigation: Including Site Design, Permit Conditions." July 2004. [http://www.nao.usace.army.mil/technical%20services/Regulatory%20branch/Guidance/Abbreviated\\_Corps-DEQ\\_Mit\\_7-04.pdf](http://www.nao.usace.army.mil/technical%20services/Regulatory%20branch/Guidance/Abbreviated_Corps-DEQ_Mit_7-04.pdf)

Ossinger, Mary. August 1999. "Success Standards for Wetland Mitigation Projects - a Guideline." Washington State Department of Transportation.

Society of Wetland Scientists, The. 2001. Position Paper on Performance Standards for Wetland Restoration and Creation. The Society of Wetland Scientists Bulletin, 18(4): 21-23. [www.bioone.org/archive/0732-9393/18/4/pdf/i0732-9393-18-4-21.pdf](http://www.bioone.org/archive/0732-9393/18/4/pdf/i0732-9393-18-4-21.pdf)

Streever, W.J. 1999. Examples of Performance Standards for Wetland Creation and Restoration in Section 404 Permits and an Approach to Developing Performance Standards. United States Army Corps of Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS, USA. WRP Technical Notes Collection (TN WRP WG-RS-3.3).  
<http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/elpubs/pdf/wgrs3-3.pdf>

Washington State Department of Transportation. April 2, 2008. "Writing Performance Measures and Performance Standards for Wetland Mitigation."  
[http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/C3CBCEFE-6EA5-4818-9203-BEEBC774ED1A/0/Mit\\_WriteMeasure.pdf](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/C3CBCEFE-6EA5-4818-9203-BEEBC774ED1A/0/Mit_WriteMeasure.pdf)

Washington State Department of Transportation. April 2, 2008. "Woody Vegetation Performance Criteria for Wetland Mitigation Sites in Washington."  
[http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/496AA0B1-8D4A-441E-80AE-9EC028EEEFB9/0/Mit\\_WoodyCover.pdf](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/496AA0B1-8D4A-441E-80AE-9EC028EEEFB9/0/Mit_WoodyCover.pdf)