



















## 2001 NRC Study

- Preferences for onsite and in-kind mitigation should not be automatic
- Decisions should be based on analytical assessments of aquatic resource needs in a watershed























Southern Watershed Area Management Plan Results				
	Preservation	Restoration		
15,888	11,487	4,401		
24,847	24.647	206		
40,746	36,128	4,607		
Acres by Funding Source				
31%	Mitigation:	15%		
23%	Other Fed:	6%		
220/	Local	20/		
	<pre>\rea Manag 15,888 24,847 40,746 'ce 31% 23%</pre>	Irea Management Plan Results           Preservation           15,888         11,487           24,847         24.647           40,746         36,128           'ce           31%         Mitigation:           23%         Other Fed:		



- Michigan - estimated cost/acre dropped from \$75 -150k to \$25-30K

23

re. Preserving life."	
Regulatory Program or	Cost Estimate (in
Authority	millions)
Clean Water Act § 404	\$2,947.3
Endangered Species Act	\$370.3
§ 10	
Federal Natural Resource	
Damage Programs	\$87.7
Federal Power Act	\$210.3
Northwest Power Act	\$207.1
Total:	\$3,822.7

Law Institute. Supported by the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation

# The Nature Conservancy Antional Research Council: 2001 Protecting nature. Preserving life. • Questioned preference for



- Questioned preference for on-site and in-kind
- Site selection should be based on an analytical assessment of wetland needs in the watershed
- Projects should maximize the likelihood that they will make an ongoing ecological contribution to the watershed







# The Nature Conservancy Protecting nature. Preserving life."

## The Watershed Approach <u>Handbook</u>

- Developed with a broad group of national experts from government, academia, and nongovernmental organizations
- Describes a range of approaches, tools, and techniques for applying a watershed approach



Dismal Swamp, NC. An 85-acre Department of Transportation (DOT) wetland mitigation project. Photo credit: © Erika Nortemann/TNC.



## The Nature Conservancy

## The Watershed Approach Handbook

- 1. Identify watershed needs
- 2. Identify desired outcomes
- 3. Identify potential project sites
- 4. Assess the potential of sites to meet watershed needs
- 5. Prioritize sites based on relative ability to address needs

Stones River Watershed, Tennessee: Wetland habitat priorities and important stream reaches.



Watershed Approach Spectrum					
	Watershed- informed decisions	Watershed analysis: non- prescribed outcomes	Watershed plan: prescribed outcomes		
ID/assess watershed needs	Questions guide consideration of watershed factors.	Identifies watershed need(s).	Identifies watershed need(s).		
ID watershed outcomes	Includes the consideration of watershed need(s).	No or little use of watershed need(s) to ID specific desired watershed outcome(s).	Describes specific, measurable desired watershed outcomes.		
ID sites across watershed	Individual assessments.	Includes analysis of the potential of sites to develop and persist.	Includes analysis of the potential of sites to develop and persist.		
Assess how sites meet needs	No assessment of the potential of sites to meet watershed needs.	Assesses the potential of sites to meet watershed needs.	Assesses the potential of sites to meet watershed needs.		
Prioritize sites & outcomes	No comparison of the relative ability of sites to sustain and to address watershed needs.	Compares sites to evaluate their relative ability to sustain and to address watershed needs.	Compares sites to evaluate their relative ability to sustain and to address 32 watershed needs.		



### Watershed Approach Elements

#### **Identify Watershed Needs**

- Existing plans, reports, analyses
- Analysis of historic losses
- Analysis of current condition
- Analysis of future threats
- Stakeholder input

#### **Identify Desired Outcomes**

Stakeholder Input

#### **Identify Potential Sites**

- Suitability and persistence of sites
- Aquatic resource conservation opportunities

Watershed Approach
Votecting nature. Preserving life
Watershed Approach
Seess Potential of Sites to Meet Watershed Needs
Condition assessments
Ecosystem service assessments
Wildlife and habitat assessments
Water quality assessments
Water quality assessments
Identify priority hydrologic units
Prioritize sites and areas
Define watershed outcomes















Montsweag Brook project, Maine. Photo credit:  $^{\odot}$  41 Brian Peters.











## Duck-Pensaukee Watershed Approach

### Watershed Needs





Wildlife Habitat Flood Abatement Water Quality Shoreline Protection Fish Habitat Surface Water Supply Carbon Storage























Next Steps				
Statewide roll-out	St. Louis River Beartrap-Nemadji			
• Deep dive in key watersheds	Bad-Montral Black-Presque Isle Ontonagon Upper Upper Chippeva Fambeau Brule Upper Menominee			
Better tools	Lower SL Croix Cedar Chippewa Eau Claire Chippewa Chippew			
<ul> <li>Implementation</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Linking to plans/programs</li> </ul>	Rush- Vermillion Black River Black River Lower Streboycan			
<ul> <li>Quantifying water quality benefits</li> </ul>	Latiosse vine Coon- Yellow Grant-Little Apple-Plum Pecatorica Rock Kishwauke Expla-Plum Pecatorica Kishwauke Kishwauke Kishwauke Kishwauke Kishwauke Kishwauke Kishwauke			

## Speaker Contact Information

Dr. Rebecca Kihslinger Wetlands Program Director Environmental Law Institute, San Francisco Kihslinger@eli.org

Palmer Hough Environmental Scientist Wetlands Division U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Hough.Palmer@epa.gov Mark P. Smith Deputy Director

North America Water Program The Nature Conservancy, Boston, MA mpsmith@TNC.ORG

Nicholas Miller Science Director The Nature Conservancy, Madison, WI nmiller@TNC.ORG





