

Typical Stream Restoration Examples:

- Repair headcuts and channel incision
- Reduce bank erosion
- Improve fish and wildlife habitat
- Increase floodplain connectivity
- Enhance riparian vegetation
- Improve form and function (often sediment transport)
- Increase water retention
- Often grant funded with very short, finite schedules



What we like about current CWA 404 permitting

- Nationwide permits help to guide projects to minimum impacts
- ACOE is basically a clearing house for coordination of multiple agency permit requirements
- Review of nationwide applications is a relatively predictable timeline that can be included in project timelines



Problems with current CWA 404

- Ephemeral channels are ecologically and physically important to mission of CWA and should be included for protection
- Requirements for SHPO and Biological Assessment are the very expensive and time consuming portions of the project, especially for smaller projects
- Monitoring requirements are often not in alignment with grant timelines and funding
- OHWM delineation may not provide any guidance for potentially adverse impacts further out in floodplain
- Despite predictability of the permit process it may be slow enough that emergency efforts are not adequately reviewed.



Some suggestions

- If any part of the project is within federal jurisdiction – CWA 404 rules have primacy and no need for state permit
- Projects that do not affect more than 10X active channel widths of stream likely don't need to be permitted
- Grade control or practices that are intended to retain current channel shape should not require review
- Restoration projects should be providing basic design analysis information (hydrology, channel size, vegetation goals etc.)
- Maintenance affecting less than 10X active channel lengths of stream should not be reviewed
- Farm practices do not need to be reviewed (including acequia management)
- Required monitoring beyond grant funding should be repeat photo monitoring only