

AQUATIC HABITAT RESTORATION TASK FORCE

MEMBERS

Bruce Carlisle (Chair), Assistant Director, Office of Coastal Zone Management

Mike Armstrong, Program Manager, Recreational and Anadromous Fisheries, Division of Marine Fisheries, Department of Fish and Game

Kathy Baskin, Water Policy Director, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Alison Bowden, Freshwater Program Director, Massachusetts Field Office, The Nature Conservancy

Hunt Durey, Manager, Wetlands Restoration Program, Office of Coastal Zone Management

Brian Graber, Associate Director, Restoring Rivers Initiative, Northeast Region, American Rivers

Bill Hubbard, Chief, Evaluation Branch, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Representing Coastal America and federal agencies

Joan Kimball, Director, Riverways Program, Department of Fish and Game

Lealdon Langley, Director, Wetlands and Waterways Program, Department of Environmental Protection

Dennis Lowry, Wetlands Ecologist, ENSR International; Representing the Massachusetts Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership

Kerry Mackin, Executive Director, Ipswich River Watershed Association

E. Heidi Ricci, Senior Policy Analyst, Mass Audubon

ALTERNATES

Priscilla Chapman, Watershed Advocate, Mass Audubon (for Heidi Ricci)

Jessica Darling, Program Coordinator, Ipswich River Watershed Association (for Kerry Mackin)

John Kick, Resource Conservationist, Massachusetts Office, Natural Resources Conservation Service; Representing Coastal America and federal agencies (for Bill Hubbard)

Beth Schreier, Resource Conservationist, Massachusetts Office, Natural Resources Conservation Service; Representing Coastal America and federal agencies (for Bill Hubbard)

Matt Schweisberg, Manager, Wetlands Protection Unit, Region 1, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Representing Coastal America and federal agencies (for Bill Hubbard)

Mike Stroman, Program Chief, Wetlands Program, Department of Environmental Protection (for Lealdon Langley)

Michael Toohill, Restoration Ecologist, ENSR International; Representing the Massachusetts Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership (for Dennis Lowry)

Laura Wildman, Director of River Science, American Rivers (for Brian Graber)



CHARTING THE COURSE: A BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE OF AQUATIC HABITAT RESTORATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

AN OVERVIEW OF THE AQUATIC HABITAT RESTORATION TASK FORCE REPORT - JANUARY 2008

MASSACHUSETTS IS A LEADER—THE FIRST STATE IN THE COUNTRY TO DEVELOP WETLANDS PROTECTION LAWS, AND A LITERAL TRAILBLAZER IN PRESERVING OPEN SPACE. Our economic leadership has resulted in tremendous industrial, commercial, agricultural, and residential growth, but with the unintended cost of widespread habitat loss and degradation. In response, Massachusetts has also become a national leader in aquatic habitat restoration—working to support the recovery of salt marshes, eelgrass beds, rivers, streams, lakes, ponds, freshwater wetlands, and other aquatic habitats that have been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. But while significant success has been achieved, tremendous opportunities remain.

THE TASK FORCE

To seize these opportunities, Energy and Environmental Affairs Secretary Ian Bowles formed the Aquatic Habitat Restoration Task Force in May 2007, with broad and balanced membership and equal representation from government and non-government entities. The Task Force held six meetings from August to November 2007 and through discussions and deliberations at the meetings and additional conversations and correspondence—achieved consensus on a course to ensure the Commonwealth's position as a national leader for aquatic habitat restoration in the decades ahead.



Photo: Stephen Gersh

¹Stedman, S. and J. Hanson. 1997. Wetlands, Fisheries and Economics in the New England Coastal States. Habitat Connections. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA Fisheries Service. ²Holliday, M.C. and B.K. O'Bannon. 2002. Fisheries of the United States. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; NOAA Fisheries Service; Office of Science and Technology; Fisheries Statistics and Economics Division.

³Schuyt, K. and L. Brander. 2004. Living Waters: The Economic Values of the World's Wetlands. World Wildlife Fund. Gland/Amsterdam. ⁴Mass Audubon. 2003. Losing Ground: Changes in Land Use and Their Impact on Habitat, Biodiversity, and Ecosystem Service in Massachusetts.

Restoration reverses the legacy of habitat alteration and destruction.

VALUE OF MASSACHUSETTS AQUATIC HABITATS

Aquatic habitats provide important environmental, social, and economic benefits for the Bay State. One study found that 32% of New England's commercial fish and shellfish directly depend on estuaries and salt marshes.¹ For 2001 landings from New Bedford and Gloucester alone, this translates to more than \$57.5 million.² Other research found that conserving wetlands is a natural, less expensive flood control solution for the Charles River—with potential economic benefits of nearly \$40 million per year.³ Another report conservatively estimated that the overall value of Massachusetts wetlands is more than \$2.3 billion per year.⁴

> While significant successes have been achieved in aquatic habitat restoration in Massacusetts, tremendous opportunities remain.

threats. s,worrow's ssəxppe pue opportunities s'yebot szimixem ues sttesudseseM restoration, tetided ziteupe ot doech to pəuoseəı pue bətenibrooc е убполу<u>т</u>



restoration success. restoration, particularly with monitoring and evaluating hance the use of science and technology in aquatic habitat successful restoration projects. Opportunities exist to enrestoration decisions, from identifying sites to designing Science and technology provide the basis for key habitat SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN RESTORATION: RECOMMENDATION #6 - MAXIMIZE THE ROLE OF

planning, design, and engineering and inventory development, as well as integrated and integration to facilitate restoration site identification ACTION #6A - Increase support for data collection

to generate more monitoring and research institutions and volunteer-based monitoring groups ACTION #6B - Expand relationships with academic

CONCLUSION

into the next decade. to aquatic habitat restoration for the next several years and of tomorrow, through a coordinated and reasoned approach maximize the opportunities of today and address the threats for success, Massachusetts will strategically position itself to take the lead in moving forward. Following this blueprint tial for future success-state government can and should ernment, non-profits, businesses, and individuals is essen-While maintaining the proven partnership model of gova top priority environmental issue for the Commonwealth. term strategy that establishes aquatic habitat restoration as These recommendations will promote a successful long-

www.mass.gov/czm/docs/pdf/AHRTF_report. AQUATIC HABITAT RESTORATION TASK FORCE, SEE: FOR A FULL COPY OF THE REPORT OF THE

> builds local capacity. build a constituency that supports increased investment and that promotes the benefits of aquatic habitat restoration can improve quality of life. An outreach and education strategy damaged natural resources, stimulate the state's economy, and aquatic habitats presents significant opportunities to recover Соизтітиеису: Тhe restoration of lost and degraded RECOMMENDATION #3 - CREATE AN INFORMED

and education strategy targeted to specific audiences ACTION #3 - Develop and implement an outreach

management expertise. budgets, full agendas, and lack of technical and project contributions-but these efforts are restricted by tight organizations and local governments could provide significant it has not reached its full potential. Numerous non-profit While a strong restoration partnership exists in Massachusetts, CAPACITY TO SUPPORT AND IMPLEMENT RESTORATION: RECOMMENDATION #4 - BUILD LOCAL AND REGIONAL

and interested landowners directly to cities and towns, non-governmental groups, ACTION #4 - Increase technical and financial support

infrastructure repair or replacement projects. that act as disincentives to pursuing restoration as part of restoration projects, and remove regulatory requirements trames, increase regulatory support and efficiency for ties exist to reduce permitting costs and regulatory time Regulating Restoration Projects: Opportuni-RECOMMENDATION #5 - ENSURE EFFICIENCY IN

ensuring adequate protections identify options for reducing time and cost while regulatory requirements for restoration projects to ACTION #5 - Conduct a comprehensive review of

> HABITAT RESTORATION TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AQUATIC THE BLUEPRINT FOR SUCCESS:

and into the next decade. achieve greater restoration results for the next several years and Environmental Affairs (EOEEA) and its partners to tended to guide the efforts of the Executive Office of Energy habitat restoration for the Commonwealth. They are inthat collectively form the blueprint for success in aquatic These six recommendations represent the big-picture steps

of restoration and mosquito control. tory requirements, and address issues concerning the intersection velop strategies for climate change adaptation, streamline regulaas MassHighways), promote habitat restoration on state land, declude the need to: coordinate with "infrastructure" agencies (such and conservation). Important policy issues requiring attention inenvironmental resource management (together with protection and elevate habitat restoration as the third component of sound should increase formal coordination, address broad policy issues, FOR AQUATIC HABITAT RESTORATION: Massachusetts RECOMMENDATION #1 - ENHANCE STATE LEADERSHIP

mental management in Massachusetts habitat restoration as an integral priority for environ-ACTION #1A - Endorse and advance aquatic

Restoration Committee ACTION #18 - Establish a new EOEEA Interagency

restoration efforts EOEEA responsible for coordinating state habitat ACTION #1C - Create a new staff position within

new sources of support will maximize results. dollars-expanding existing resources and identifying each state dollar leverages more than three non-state restoration provides a 200% return on investment.⁵ Since areas. In the Great Lakes region, a recent study found that has not been fully quantified in Massachusetts, it has in other graded. While the economic value of restoring these resources aquatic habitat in the Commonwealth have been lost or de-TO RAXIMIZE RESTORATION RESULTS: Large areas of RECOMMENDATION #2 - INVEST STRATEGICALLY

key projects, and allocate appropriate resources ACTION #2A - Define restoration objectives, identify

other's resources non-profit, and private investments leverage each coordination to ensure that state, federal, local, ACTION #2B - Engage in strategic planning and

build new partnerships ACTION #2C - Actively seek new resources and

NOITAROTERA OT HOAOR99 A MART A

approach are the citizens and landowners who have sought suming key roles on projects—and at the heart of the team government groups actively support restoration efforts, many asprovide technical support and millions of dollars in grants; nonmanaging projects from concept to completion; federal agencies providing technical assistance, helping to leverage funding, and range of services, including developing regional restoration plans, business, non-profits, and citizens. State government provides a model that draws support and participation from government, Massachusetts, restoration operates on a proven partnership requiring the resources and expertise of many partners. In Habitat restoration is often complex and long-term, typically

restoration in efforts to improve their communities.

more lie ahead. identified and await restoration action, and hundreds however. Hundreds of viable sites have already been clearly restoration efforts only scratch the surface of the challenge, aquatic habitat alteration and destruction. Current • UNDO PAST DAMAGE: Restoration reverses the legacy of

tat restoration, tremendous opportunities remain, providing the

While Massachusetts has made important strides in aquatic habi-

unparalleled potential to:

NOITAROTEER TATIBAH

7HE POTENTIAL FOR

funds for Massachusetts projects await match. and \$24 million of Natural Resources Conservation Service For example, \$20 million of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers millions in federal funds remain unmatched and unused. restoration leverages three non-state dollars. However, LEVERAGE FUNDS: On average, every state dollar spent on

local capacity for future restoration efforts. proven team approach builds long-term and sustainable restoration catalyze local action. The Commonwealth's • EMPOWER LOCAL INVOLVEMENT: State efforts in habitat

to address these impacts. help ensure that infrastructure is designed and maintained integrate restoration plans into adaptation strategies, and can identify climate change impacts on natural systems, through habitat restoration. Strategically coordinated efforts change adds urgency to the need to undo past damage • Ряомоте Сымате Снаисе Resilieису: Сlimate

enhanced by further state leadership and investment. as a national leader in habitat restoration, which will be habitts provide. Massachusetts maintains a stellar reputation and global efforts to protect the essential services these restoration is an important and growing element of national • DEMONSTRATE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP: Habitat