

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Purpose and Objectives	1
MDE Wetland Mitigation Program Background	2
Wetland Functional Assessment	12
Mitigation Site Scoring Method	15
Monitoring a Subset of Wetland Mitigation Sites	18
<i>IRIS Tubes</i>	21
<i>Soil Sampling</i>	28
<i>Detailed Site Assessment</i>	30
Monitoring by Permittees	31
Mitigation Project Site Location	33
Mitigation Project Status	34
Administrative Evaluation	42
Consolidated Sites	57
Compensation Fund Summary	68
Programmatic Mitigation Sites	79
Functional Assessment Using GIS	85
Conclusions and Recommendations for MDE Wetland Mitigation Program	
Improvements	92
Bibliography	98
Acronyms	99
Appendices	
A.1: Mitigation Site Scoring Method worksheet	101
A.2: Instructions for the Completing the Mitigation Site Scoring Method Worksheet	106
B: Results from the IRIS Tube Monitoring at the Subset Wetland Mitigation Sites	112

FIGURES & TABLES

Figures

1: Wetland mitigation site scores by acreage	18
2: Map of more extensively monitored mitigation sites in Maryland	20
3: IRIS tube installation	25
4: Before and after shot of IRIS tubes	26
5: Soil organic matter at select wetland mitigation sites	29
6: Soil pH at select wetland mitigation sites	30
7: Percentage, based on area, of mitigation projects permitted prior to January 1, 2007 that were completed on-site, off-site, both on and off-site, and those that are not currently known	33
8: Percentage of mitigation projects permitted prior to January 1, 2007 that were completed on-site, off-site, both on and off-site, and those that are not currently known	34
9: Success of Permittee Mitigation Projects, based on number of projects, for permits issued prior to January 1, 2007	37

10: Success of Permittee Mitigation Projects, based on area, for permits issued prior to January 1, 2007	38
11: Success rates, based on acreage, of the three major types of wetland mitigation used by Permittee Mitigation Projects permitted prior to January 1, 2007	39
12: Example of a wetland mitigation site written off as a failure due to lack of hydrology and extensive mowing	40
13: Success of Permittee Mitigation Projects, based on area and vegetation types, for permits issued prior to January 1, 2007	41
14: Success of Permittee Mitigation Projects, based on area, for each Sub Basin, for permits issued prior to January 1, 2007	42
15: Number of Phase II Mitigation Plans Submitted	43
16: Timeliness of Submitted Phase II Mitigation Plans	44
17: Extensions for submitted Phase II mitigation plans	45
18: Time from Permit Issuance to Approval of Phase II Mitigation Plan	46
19: Time from Permit Issuance to Mitigation Completion	47
20: Time from Approval of Phase II Mitigation Plan to Mitigation Completion	48
21: Percentage of projects with required mitigation that submitted monitoring reports	49
22: Monitoring Reports Submitted by Year for Projects Doing Any Monitoring	50
23: Percentage of projects that submitted monitoring reports on time	51
24: Approved Permanent Impacts by County for Permittees Not Paying into the MDE Compensation Fund	52
25: Approved Permanent Impacts by Sub Basins for Permittees Not Paying Into the MDE Compensation Fund	53
26: Mitigation by construction type (created, restored, enhanced) and vegetation type	54
27: Mitigation type (construction and vegetation type) by County	55
28: Mitigation type (construction and vegetation type) by Sub Basins	56
29: Total Authorized Permanent Impacts vs Gains by Sub Basin from 1991-2006	57
30: Approved Permanent Impacts by County and Vegetative Type for Projects Paying into the MDE Wetland Mitigation Compensation Fund	69
31: Approved Permanent Impacts by Sub Basin and Vegetative Type for Projects Paying into the MDE Wetland Mitigation Compensation Fund	70
32: Required Mitigation by County and Vegetative Type for Projects Paying into the MDE Wetland Mitigation Compensation Fund	71
33: Required Mitigation by Sub Basin and Vegetative Type for Projects Paying into the MDE Wetland Mitigation Compensation Fund	72
34: North Point State Park wetland mitigation site, contributing watershed, 600 meter buffer, nearby wetlands, and Aerials Express 2005 photography	90
35: Hedderick wetland mitigation site, contributing watershed, 600 meter buffer, nearby wetlands, and Aerials Express 2005 photography	91
36: Example of a wetland mitigation site with relatively sterile, gravelly soil, which is inhibiting vegetation growth	96
37: Example of a wetland mitigation site that has been encroached upon and partially destroyed by way of mowing	97

Tables

1: Background on twelve subset wetland mitigation sites chosen for more intensive monitoring by Maryland Department of the Environment	19
2: Characteristics of IRIS tube site locations	22
3: Number of IRIS tubes installed, number replaced, and number with sufficient reduction, scores from Mitigation Site Scoring Method, use of transects/other observational methods, number of soils samples analyzed	27
4: Summary of transect/observation points	31
5: Approved Permanent Impacts by 8-Digit Watershed and Vegetative Type for Projects Paying into the MDE Wetland Mitigation Compensation Fund. Includes all projects issued prior to January 1, 2007	73
6: Required Mitigation by 8-Digit Watershed and Vegetative Type for Projects Paying into the MDE Wetland Mitigation Compensation Fund. Includes all projects issued prior to January 1, 2007	76
7: Programmatic Mitigation Sites	79
8: Functional indicator scores, as derived from FUGRO desktop method, for the wetland mitigation sites Hedderick and North Point	92