

Mitigation Ratios for Western Washington

Taken from Table 1a. Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10. March 2006. Wetland Mitigation in Washington State – Part 1: Agency Policies and Guidance (Version 1). Washington State Department of Ecology Publication #06-06-011a. Olympia, WA.

Category and Type of Wetland Impacts	Re-establishment or Creation	Rehabilitation Only ¹	Re-establishment or Creation (R/C) and Rehabilitation (RH) ¹	Re-establishment or Creation (R/C) and Enhancement (E) ¹	Enhancement Only ¹
All Category IV	1.5:1	3:1	1:1 R/C and 1:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 2:1 E	6:1
All Category III	2:1	4:1	1:1 R/C and 2:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 4:1 E	8:1
Category II Estuarine	Case-by-case	4:1 Rehabilitation of an estuarine wetland	Case-by-case	Case-by-case	Case-by-case
Category II Interdunal	2:1 Compensation must be interdunal wetland	4:1 Compensation must be interdunal wetland	1:1 R/C and 2:1 RH Compensation must be interdunal wetland	Not considered an option ²	Not considered an option ²
All other Category II	3:1	6:1	1:1 R/C and 4:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 8:1 E	12:1
Category 1 Forested	6:1	12:1	1:1 R/C and 10:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 20:1 E	24:1
Category 1 – based on score for functions	4:1	8:1	1:1 R/C and 6:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 12:1 E	16:1
Category 1 Natural Heritage site	Not considered possible	6:1 Rehabilitation of a Natural Heritage site	R/C Not considered possible ³	R/C Not considered possible ³	Case-by-case
Category 1 Coastal Lagoon	Not considered possible	6:1 Rehabilitation of a coastal lagoon	R/C Not considered possible ³	R/C Not considered possible ³	Case-by-case
Category 1 Bog	Not considered possible	6:1 Rehabilitation of a bog	R/C Not considered possible ³	R/C Not considered possible ³	Case-by-case
Category 1 Estuarine	Case-by-case	6:1 Rehabilitation of a estuarine wetland	Case-by-case	Case-by-case	Case-by-case

Note: Typical ratios for preservation are discussed in Section 6.5.5.

¹ These ratios are based on the assumption that the rehabilitation or enhancement actions implemented represent the average degree of improvement possible for the site. Proposals to implement more effective rehabilitation or enhancement actions may result in a lower ratio, while less effective actions may result in a higher ratio. The distinction between rehabilitation and enhancement is not clear-cut. Instead, rehabilitation and enhancement actions span a continuum. Proposals that fall within the gray area between rehabilitation and enhancement will result in a ratio that lies between the ratios for rehabilitation and the ratios for enhancement (see Appendix H for further discussion).

² Due to the dynamic nature of interdunal systems, enhancement is not considered an ecologically appropriate action.

³ Natural Heritage sites, coastal lagoons, and bogs are considered irreplaceable wetlands because they perform some functions that cannot be replaced through compensatory mitigation. Impacts to such wetlands would therefore result in a net loss of some functions no matter what kind of compensation is proposed.