

Subobjective 4.3.2: Increase Wetlands. By 2008, working with partners, achieve a net increase of 400,000 acres of wetlands with additional focus on biological and functional measures **to ensure qualitative gains.** (2002 Baseline: annual net loss of an estimated 58,500 acres.)^e

IV-WD-4: Number of major projects that have been completed in States and Tribes that significantly improve the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation.

EPA's Headquarters and Regional Wetlands Program are working with states, tribes, other federal agencies, and local entities to increase the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation.

* watershed = 14 digit HUC (approximately 10-50 square miles)

Target Number	Accomplishment
	Number of states, tribes, local governments, or other organizations that . . .
	. . . applied for and received a Wetlands Program or other grant focused on building state, tribal or local capacity to improve compensatory mitigation success/programs
	. . . completed an evaluation of the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation in a watershed*, county (or equivalent), tribe or state.
	. . . established and published state, tribal or local mitigation policies and guidelines that will improve the effectiveness and success of compensatory mitigation
	. . . developed and is now implementing state, tribal or local performance standards for compensatory mitigation
	. . . is implementing a project or program to monitor the establishment, success and acreage of compensatory mitigation
	. . . has <u>developed</u> an effective, publically accessible, compensatory mitigation database that tracks acreage and locations of the permitted wetland and stream impacts, the corresponding compensatory mitigation required, the aquatic resource functions lost at the project site, and the aquatic functions replaced at the mitigation site
	. . . is <u>implementing</u> an effective, publically accessible, compensatory mitigation database that tracks acreage and locations of the permitted wetland and stream impacts, the corresponding compensatory mitigation required, the aquatic resource functions lost at the project site, and the aquatic functions replaced at the mitigation site

	. . . is implementing an effective program to enforce compensatory mitigation using appropriate state, tribal, federal or local authorities
	. . . identified and published (during this fiscal year) a listing of priority sites for mitigation/restoration in a watershed*
	. . . established and published (during this fiscal year) new or updated state, tribal or local mitigation banking policies and guidelines
	. . . published (during this fiscal year) guidance that emphasizes the protection of aquatic resources that currently cannot be restored or created
	. . . published (during this fiscal year) guidance on the appropriate considerations for mitigating impacts to streams
	. . . based on current monitoring results, can show that more than 50 percent of the compensatory mitigation projects required during the previous six years have met state, tribal and/or local Performance Standards
	. . . based on current monitoring results, can show that more than 70 percent of the compensatory mitigation projects required during the previous six years have met state, tribal and/or local Performance Standards
	. . . based on current monitoring results, can show that more than 90 percent of the compensatory mitigation projects required during the previous six years have met state, tribal and/or local Performance Standards
	. . . completed (during this fiscal year) a statewide/tribal area-wide evaluation of potential mitigation/restoration sites
	Number of watersheds* in which evaluations of potential mitigation/restoration sites were completed this fiscal year
	Number of watersheds* in which the overall mitigation success rate increased by at least 20 percent compared to five years ago.
	<u>TOTAL</u> of above