

## Mitigation Ratios for Eastern Washington

Taken From Table 1b. 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 <sup>1</sup>	Re-establishment or Creation (R/C) and Rehabilitation (RH) <sup>1</sup>	Re-establishment or Creation (R/C) and Enhancement (E) <sup>1</sup>	Enhancement Only <sup>1</sup>
<b>All Category IV</b>	1.5:1	3:1	1:1 R/C and 1:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 2:1 E	6:1
<b>All Category III</b>	2:1	4:1	1:1 R/C and 2:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 4:1 E	8:1
<b>Category II Forested</b>	4:1	8:1	1:1 R/C and 4:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 6:1 RH	16:1
<b>Category II Vernal pool</b>	2:1 Compensation must be seasonally ponded wetland	4:1 Compensation must be seasonally ponded wetland	1:1 R/C and 2:1 RH	Case-by-case	Case-by-case
<b>All other Category II</b>	3:1	6:1	1:1 R/C and 4:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 8:1 E	12:1
<b>Category 1 Forested</b>	6:1	12:1	1:1 R/C and 10:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 20:1 E	24:1
<b>Category 1 – based on score for functions</b>	4:1	8:1	1:1 R/C and 6:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 12:1 E	16:1
<b>Category 1 Natural Heritage site</b>	Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	6:1 Rehabilitation of a Natural Heritage site	R/C Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	R/C Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	Case-by-case
<b>Category 1 Alkali</b>	Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	6:1 Rehabilitation of an alkali wetland	R/C Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	R/C Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	Case-by-case
<b>Category 1 Bog</b>	Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	6:1 Rehabilitation of a bog	R/C Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	R/C Not considered possible <sup>2</sup>	Case-by-case
<b>Note:</b> Ratios for preservation are discussed in Section 6.5.5.					

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> Natural Heritage sites, alkali wetland 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.