Living shorelines: Long term resilience & encouraging use

Donna Marie Bilkovic, Molly Mitchell, Pam Mason, Robert Isdell

Center for Coastal Resources Management Virginia Institute of Marine Science College of William & Mary, USA





*donnab@vims.edu http://ccrm.vims.edu



Long-term resilience



Enhancing use & acceptance





Long-term resilience



Enhancing use & acceptance



The problem with shoreline armoring



Habitat loss & fragmentation – forest, wetlands ¹

Sediment supply & transport altered, increased scouring, turbidity ²

Increase in invasive species ³

Declines in fish, invertebrate, & marsh bird diversity, terrapin presence ⁴

Prevents natural migration of habitats with SLR

Decline in seagrass resilience⁵



¹ Peterson and Lowe 2009; Dugan et al 2011, ² Bozek and Burdick 2005, NRC 2007, ³ Chambers et al 1999, ⁴ Peterson et al 2000, Chapman 2003, King et al 2005, Bilkovic et al 2006, Seitz et al 2006, Bilkovic & Roggero 2008, Morley et al 2012, Isdell et al. 2015, Kornis et al. 2017a,b ⁵Patrick et al. 2014

Continuum of shoreline protection approaches



Temporal Changes in Shoreline Permit Requests

■ Bulkhead ■ Riprap ■ Living Shoreline





Long-term resilience

Enhancing use & acceptance



Enhancing living shoreline long-term resilience

Pathways to Long term resilience

- Siting areas with retreat opportunities likely to have enhanced longevity under sea level rise
- Allow Dynamic Designs that take advantage of natural processes that enhance sediment accretion, marsh surface elevation, marsh stability and adaptability
- Maintenance for settings that need a boost – e.g.. raise elevations with sediment deposits







Siting – retreat potential



Retreat potential

- About 70% of VA shorelines may require some shoreline protection (11,000 km)
- A living shoreline is suitable on <u>86%</u> of those shorelines
- With expected SLR by 2050, 14% of those living shorelines may not be able to retreat.
 - 2% with impervious surface barriers
 - 2% with agriculture barriers
 - 10% will intersect turf/grass (yards, parks, golf courses)

Allow Dynamic Designs



- Design projects for marsh productivity and sediment retention
- Allow plants to move and settle into the optimal tide elevations *this will enhance sediment capture (horizontally and vertically)*
- Encourage plant growth Tall, dense canopies reduce more wave energy (and capture more sediment)
- Allow movement landward with rising seas (don't mow!)
- Encourage the settlement of marsh mussels on *Spartina enhance sediment capture and marsh stability*

Plan for Maintenance

Some settings are likely to need assistance

- Extreme sea level rise
- Low natural sediment input
- Vegetation stress: exposed to invasive plants or high rates of herbivory
- **Options include**
 - Periodic sediment addition, thinlayer spray dredging
 - Continued invasive removal
 - A maintenance plan with contractors so costs are understood up front







Long-term resilience



Enhancing use & acceptance



Enhancing the use and acceptance of living shorelines

Incentives

- tax break
- cost-share programs/low-no interest loans (e.g. VCAP)
- streamlined permit process
- Permit fee waiver
- societal/neighbor appreciation

Education

- eliminate misinformation
- consistent messaging about co-benefits
- Training, design assistance <u>http://www.vims.edu/ccrm/outreach/living_shorelines/resources/index.php</u>
- Shoreline management model site suitability <u>http://ccrm.vims.edu/ccrmp</u>

Co-benefit valuation and crediting

- Economic benefits to locality, community, state (e.g., TMDL credits)
- Community Rating System (CRS) –encourages community floodplain management activities; reduced flood insurance premium rates

State-level promotion

- State regulations to prefer living shorelines (Living shoreline Acts)
- Build into state resiliency plans



Priority next steps

- Identify areas with high long term resilience potential to help prioritize restoration activities (e.g. areas with sediment sources for marsh maintenance, retreat potential)
- Track the effectiveness of incentives and other programs for living shoreline implementation
- Promotion and branding should encourage the acceptance of the dynamic nature of living shorelines for maximum benefits and longevity
- Continued research on project designs in urban and more rural settings that may enhance longevity and minimize maintenance costs.

Questions?

I would like to acknowledge my colleagues at Center for Coastal Resources Management at VIMS, especially David Stanhope, Kory Angstadt, Julie Bradshaw, Christine Tombleson, Karen Duhring, Kirk Havens, Carl Hershner



THANK YOU!

donnab@vims.edu