



## **Stream Mitigation Fund for Tennessee**

### **2025 RFP Q&A Responses**

#### **General**

1. **Question:** Can you provide the shape file of the Service Areas map?  
**Answer:** A .kml (Google Earth) file of the service areas is available for download via <https://ribits.ops.usace.army.mil/>. Within the menu, navigate to “ILF Programs” then navigate to the Tennessee Stream Mitigation Program. The service area map includes a link to download the .kml file.
2. **Question:** Have available credits from existing banks been secured in advance of this RFP issuance? If not, why?  
**Answer:** Only questions regarding the RFP, Narrative Application, submission process, or evaluation process will be addressed by this Q&A.
3. **Question:** In a March of 2021 Special Public Notice terminating the TSMP In-Lieu Fee agreement, it was cited that there was a total, state-wide credit liability of approximately 169,000 credits. The credit liability described in the current SMFT RFP totals approximately 145,605 credits. The credit differential between the previously identified TSMP credit deficit and the current RFP liability is 23,395 credits. Can this variance be explained?  
**Answer:** Only questions regarding the RFP, Narrative Application, submission process, or evaluation process will be addressed by this Q&A.
4. **Question:** Is the SMFT fully controlled and operated by the staff of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF), or is the management of the fund shared with other entities? If so, who would those be and what is the role of each stakeholder in program oversight?  
**Answer:** Please refer to the Overview section of the RFP.
5. **Question:** The RFP indicates that all queries and proposals be sent directly to the SMFT program, organized by NFWF. Will the NFWF be the sole entity responsible for the selection of proposed project sites associated with this RFP, or will other agencies or organizations, such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nashville and Memphis Districts (USACE) or Tennessee Department of Conservation (TDEC),” participate in the selection process? If entities other than NFWF will be involved in proposal review and project selection, please identify them and their level of involvement in project selection.  
**Answer:** Please refer to the Overview section of the RFP.
6. **Question:** Any chance of an in person meeting to discuss this RFP. A one-time written Q&A will most likely leave a lot of uncertainty in this process.  
**Answer:** An in-person meeting will not be held in support of this RFP.

#### **Narrative Application Process**

7. **Question:** In the RFP document on page 1, it states "Projects that straddle multiple service areas will also be considered." If we propose a site with a service area that straddles multiple



RFP service areas, can we propose one price for either service area and let the RFP team select which service area they prefer? Or do we need to propose a specific service area?

**Answer:** Variable service area pricing may be proposed for projects that are located in more than one service area as defined in the RFP. Service areas associated with an existing approved mitigation bank do not apply to this RFP; credit sales should be proposed in the RFP service area that the existing approved mitigation bank is located in. In this scenario, proposals should specify which service areas a project is located in, the amount of credit that would be generated from mitigation activities occurring in each respective service area, and the price of credits for each respective service area.

8. **Question:** Will mitigation projects currently under review by the IRT be required to be withdrawn from review to be submitted for this RFP?

**Answer:** Projects currently under review do not have to be withdrawn; however, to be considered for this RFP, a complete Narrative Application must be submitted regardless of the mitigation project's review status under 33CFR332.

9. **Question:** Will partial awards be considered if the proposal exceeds service area needs?

**Answer:** Yes.

10. **Question:** Please confirm the RFP intent is for proposals to utilize the provided Request for RFP application word doc, or can proposals use a custom format that incorporates the same information?

**Answer:** To submit a proposal, complete the Narrative Application in the format provided (i.e., using the Word document provided on the NFWF SMFT website).

11. **Question:** For a mitigation bank with an approved MBI or prospectus, can the application sections I and II and attachments a-d reference the MBI or prospectus rather than reiterate that information in the application format?

**Answer:** To submit a proposal, complete the Narrative Application in the format provided (i.e., using the Word document provided on the NFWF SMFT website). In other words, information from the approved mitigation banking instrument should be used to populate the narrative application.

12. **Question:** If released bank credits are submitted is all the technical information still required also?

**Answer:** To submit a proposal, complete the Narrative Application in the format provided (i.e., using the Word document provided on the NFWF SMFT website). In other words, information from the approved mitigation banking instrument should be used to populate the narrative application.

13. **Question:** What is the notification deadline of our intent to submit a project to receive the upload link?

**Answer:** There is no formal deadline, but we strongly suggest not waiting until the last minute in order to give yourself time to ensure a complete application package has been



assembled and correctly uploaded. We recommend emailing [SMFT@nfwf.org](mailto:SMFT@nfwf.org) no later than mid-November.

14. **Question:** Is there a page maximum for a proposal for a given site?

**Answer:** No.

15. **Question:** If a project is submitted with multiple alternatives, should those be combined into a single proposal or separate proposal for each alternative?

**Answer:** Each alternative should be submitted as a stand-alone proposal.

16. **Question:** For a mitigation bank with multiple watersheds within its service area, will the project sponsor need to specify which the watershed(s) credits can be purchased from, or can that be left to the selection committee to choose?

**Answer:** If a project spans more than one RFP service area, the credits will be allocated based on the service area the individual mitigation streams are located in. The Narrative Application should specify the number of credits that would be generated from each individual service area.

17. **Question:** Are dam removal projects viable projects for submittal? And if so, how will credits be quantified?

**Answer:** Yes. For general guidance on how to credit dam removal projects, see attached *Dam Removal Compensatory Mitigation Potential* tables.

18. **Question:** Can NFWF confirm whether proposals can be submitted for multiple service areas within a single proposal, or should each be submitted separately?

**Answer:** If a project spans multiple service areas, credit totals will be identified for each service area the project is constructed in and submitted as one proposal. The project's service area is assigned by the RFP Service Area Map, located on page 1 of the RFP. Each unique mitigation site will be submitted as a single proposal.

19. **Question:** Are there any limitations on the number of proposals a single entity can submit?

**Answer:** No.

20. **Question:** Is on-site biological sampling required? If yes, please specify if it is required for proposal, mitigation plan, or monitoring?

**Answer:** In accordance with Section II(F), of the Narrative Application, all submittals should include "a summary of Biological Sampling Report or TDEC Available Biological Data. If biological sampling was conducted, please attach the biological report." Section II(F) of the Narrative Application states that an applicant should "contact TDEC to obtain any pre-existing biological scores for the waterbody at or near the proposed project reach. If this information does not exist or is determined to no longer be valid, the State may elect to evaluate the site to establish existing biological conditions. In consultation with TDEC, the applicant may provide biological scores following the standardized protocols found in TDEC's Quality System Standard Operating Procedure for Macroinvertebrate Stream Surveys. Depending on site conditions and proposed treatments, biological scores may be



requested for each unique stream reach within the project area.” It is anticipated that biological sampling would be submitted with the Narrative Application.

21. **Question:** If TDEC does not have existing biological data available for a potential site, and the applicant is therefore required to collect biological data, will a proposal be considered incomplete if the data have been collected but not yet processed? What about if the data have not been collected as the applicant waits for the selection results?

**Answer:** Section II(F) of the Narrative Application states that an applicant should “contact TDEC to obtain any pre-existing biological scores for the waterbody at or near the proposed project reach. If this information does not exist or is determined to no longer be valid, the State may elect to evaluate the site to establish existing biological conditions. In consultation with TDEC, the applicant may provide biological scores following the standardized protocols found in TDEC's Quality System Standard Operating Procedure for Macroinvertebrate Stream Surveys. Depending on site conditions and proposed treatments, biological scores may be requested for each unique stream reach within the project area.” Failure to provide the requisite biological data may negatively affect evaluation of the proposal.

## Post-Selection

22. **Question:** Please provide the anticipated regulatory review process and schedule. Are these projects intended to be single-user mitigation banks and follow a mitigation banking IRT regulatory process? Or will the regulatory process be more like a full-delivery or PRM project with accelerated review timelines?

**Answer:** Except for awards that are limited to the sale of released credits, all awarded projects must follow the review process outlined in 33CFR332.8(d).

23. **Question:** Will the regulatory process be accelerated to allow projects to be initiated within six months?

**Answer:** Except for awards that are limited to the sale of released credits, all awarded projects must follow the review process outlined in 33CFR332.8(d).

24. **Question:** Further explain/define this: Initiated means the site has been secured and/or acquired, and initial physical and biological improvements (e.g., grading and planting) have been started.

**Answer:** In other words, active construction must be started on the site.

25. **Question:** Are preservation projects considered to have "physical and biological improvements"?

**Answer:** As per 33CFR332.2, “[p]reservation does not result in a gain of aquatic resource area or functions.” In the context of a preservation project, “initiated” means the legal site protection mechanism (e.g., conservation easement) has been executed.

26. **Question:** Upon project selection, will NFWF notify the public about awards issued with this initial solicitation and how those awards will affect remaining Tennessee Stream Mitigation



Program (TSMP) credit liabilities within the established geographic service areas identified in the RFP?

**Answer:** Selected projects will follow the review process spelled out in 33CFR332.8(d). Upon notification of award, the awardee should submit a complete prospectus to the USACE,

which will initiate the public notice process for each selected site. Any future RFP(s) would identify the amount remaining in the SMFT and service areas with remaining need.

27. **Question:** What has the IRT agreed to re: review timelines for awarded projects? 2008 guideline timelines? Expedited?

**Answer:** Except for awards that are limited to the sale of released credits, all awarded projects must follow the review process outlined in 33CFR332.8(d).

28. **Question:** Can NFWF please provide a copy of the agreement terms you anticipate being included in the agreement between the awardee and NFWF? If a draft agreement is not yet available, can you please provide the federal terms likely to be included or provide the relevant federal agency contact information to acquire applicable terms?

**Answer:** Except for awards that are limited to the sale of released credits, all awarded projects must follow the review process outlined in 33CFR332.8(d). If and when a project prospectus is approved by the USACE and IRT, the project proponent will enter into an agreement with NFWF. A draft of the agreement will be shared on the SMFT webpage in September.

29. **Question:** Once the contract is awarded, will it move directly to Prospectus submittal or draft MBI since a site walk has already occurred?

**Answer:** Except for awards that are limited to the sale of released credits, all awarded projects must follow the review process spelled out in 33CFR332.8(d). Upon notification of award, the awardee should submit a complete prospectus to the USACE to start the review process and initiate the public notice process. If and when a project prospectus is approved by the USACE and IRT, the project proponent will enter into an agreement with NFWF.

30. **Question:** When do financial assurances have to be funded? (LTE)

**Answer:** Appendix C of the RFP identifies the project milestones that must be met in order to receive payments. For projects that include restoration or enhancement, construction financial assurances are required to be secured prior to both the initial credit release and the first payment from the SMFT. Adaptive management & monitoring financial Assurances must be fully funded prior to the post-construction credit release and second payment from the SMFT.

## Evaluation Process

31. **Question:** Can NFWF provide a technical evaluation rubric? How will technical evaluation be used to adjust unit pricing for decision of contract awards?

**Answer:** The Technical evaluation factor is comprised of the Technical Approach, Technical Risk, and Personnel Qualifications subfactors. All non-cost evaluation factors and subfactors are of approximately equal importance to each other, and all non-cost evaluation factors,



when combined, are of approximately equal importance to the Cost evaluation factor. The evaluation will not adjust the submitted unit pricing. However, technical evaluations will also evaluate proposed credit ratios to confirm their appropriateness.

32. **Question:** Is documentation of land control (i.e. purchase contract or easement option) required? If not, would that increase technical scoring or likelihood of contract award if provided?  
**Answer:** Documentation of land control is not required at the time of submittal. However, the submittal must provide a signed Right of Entry Form in addition to a description of the proposed legal arrangements and instruments, including site ownership, that will be used to ensure the long-term protection of the compensatory mitigation project site.
33. **Question:** Does NFWF intend to award at least one project in each service area of need, provided there are sufficient project submittals? Or will service areas with smaller mitigation deficits only receive an award if funds are not fully used in the watersheds of highest need?  
**Answer:** Greater consideration will be given to service areas with larger credit liabilities. However, the overall project allocations by service area will also depend on where acceptable proposals are received.
34. **Question:** How will itemized budgets for construction, monitoring, adaptive management and long term management be factored into the cost evaluation? Is the cost per credit not the determining factor in the cost evaluation?  
**Answer:** Itemized budgets for construction, monitoring, adaptive management, and long term management will be evaluated to ensure they are sufficiently funded and represent realistic costs.
35. **Question:** Is there a minimum project size that will be accepted for an individual site submitted? (Specifically stream length)  
**Answer:** No minimum limit has been placed on the project size.
36. **Question:** How will NFWF weigh projects that are high-cost but fill a critical deficit in a high-liability service area?  
**Answer:** Please refer to the Geographic Focus and Evaluation Criteria sections of the RFP.
37. **Question:** Is there an identified priority area or is the bid looking to maximize the spend?  
**Answer:** Please refer to the Geographic Focus and Evaluation Criteria sections of the RFP.
38. **Question:** Will there be some percentages of needs for each area or will the bulk of the money go to one area if it is significantly cheaper pricing on a per credit basis?  
**Answer:** Please refer to the Geographic Focus and Evaluation Criteria sections of the RFP.
39. **Question:** It states that project will be evaluated on a cost per credit basis, but that overall cost will be considered to ensure projects are distributed across service areas with larger deficits. Can an example be provided of how that would work?  
**Answer:** Please refer to the Geographic Focus and Evaluation Criteria sections of the RFP.





40. **Question:** Expand upon this element of the “Significant Strengths:” Proposals that demonstrate the project can be initiated within six months after funds are awarded. Initiated means the site has been secured and/or acquired, and initial physical and biological

improvements (e.g., grading and planting) have been started. This is unreasonable to expect unless they are mitigation sites currently close to IRT approval (draft and/or final banking instrument).

**Answer:** Refer to Appendix C (Credit Release and Payment Schedules) of the RFP. Initial funding would occur upon final instrument approval, execution of site protection, and procurement of construction financial assurances. A “significant strength” would be considered if project construction occurred within 6 months of that initial project milestone.

41. **Question:** How does NFWF define “initiated within 6 months” (land acquisition)

**Answer:** “Initiated” means the site has been secured and/or acquired, and initial physical and biological improvements (e.g., grading and planting) have been started.

### Financial Assurances and Long-term Management

42. **Question:** Can you refer me to anyone on your team that can address the need for surety bonds either for NFWF directly or for grantees of NFWF managed funds?

**Answer:** In accordance with 33 CFR 332.3(n), “[s]ufficient financial assurances must be provided to ensure a high level of confidence that the compensatory mitigation project will be successfully completed, in accordance with applicable performance standards... Financial assurances may be in the form of performance bonds, escrow accounts, casualty insurance, letters of credit, legislative appropriations for government sponsored projects, or other appropriate instruments, subject to the approval of the USACE district engineer.” Financial assurance templates may be found under “Compensatory Mitigation” on the following website: <https://www.lrd.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Tennessee/>

43. **Question:** In the RFP Narrative Application, II.2C, Long-term management (pg 7/11), are there suggested financial contributions for the endowment for long-term management activities? A certain percent of the total expected credit generation? As it states IV.E, (pg 9/11) the long-term management budget includes easement stewardship, regular monitoring, biennial reporting, legal defense, signage replacement, access upkeep (e.g., gates) if required.

**Answer:** Suggested financial contributions for the endowment of long-term management activities will not be provided. The proposed long-term management budget should reflect actual cost estimates for maintaining the mitigation site in the long-term. A number of calculators are available including The Nature Conservancy’s *Long-Term Stewardship Calculator* which can be found at:

<https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationPlanning/ToolsData/Pages/stewardshipcalculator.aspx>

### Ephemeral Streams

44. **Question:** How will ephemerals be handled?



**Answer:** Mitigation proposals which include ephemeral streams will be evaluated in accordance with the Technical, Past Performance, and Cost Factors as described in the RFP.

**45. Question:** Can we do all levels of restoration on these NOW non-jurisdictional streams?

**Answer:** Mitigation proposals, including those with ephemeral streams, should be appropriate, ecologically suitable, and technically feasible in relation to the quality and condition of the individual stream.

**46. Question:** Will the 15% percent rule be enforced? I.E. only 15% of the credits can be generated from ephemeral streams.

**Answer:** Yes. No more than 15% of the total mitigation project credits can be generated from ephemeral streams.

### Site Protection

**47. Question:** Do all projects require a conservation easement with a 50 foot buffer?

**Answer:** A minimum of 50-foot buffers are generally required and are expected to have long-term site protection. Minor deviations may be considered on a case-by-case basis.

**48. Question:** Does the provider need to provide an easement holder? Or is NFWF able to hold the easement?

**Answer:** The applicant should identify both the proposed site protection mechanism as well as the proposed third party holder of the mechanism. NFWF will not be holding conservation easements for projects approved through this RFP.

**49. Question:** Is an executed and recorded landowner agreement required as part of our proposals? Or can that be finalized within six months of a contract award?

**Answer:** Documentation of land control is not required at the time of submittal. However, the submittal must include a signed Right of Entry Form in addition to a description of the proposed legal arrangements and instruments, including site ownership, that will be used to ensure the long-term protection of the compensatory mitigation project site.

**50. Question:** Per the 2004 guidelines, all projects will require perpetual protection, correct? If so, please share USACE approved template(s). Is this required on projects proposed on public lands (state parks, etc.)?

**Answer:** As per 33 CFR 332.7(a), “[t]he aquatic habitats, riparian areas, buffers, and uplands that comprise the overall compensatory mitigation project must be provided long-term protection through real estate instruments or other available mechanisms, as appropriate.” This provision of the regulation further states, “[f]or government property, long-term protection may be provided through federal facility management plans or integrated natural resources management plans. When approving a method for long-term protection of non-government property other than transfer of title, the district engineer shall consider relevant legal constraints on the use of conservation easements and/ or restrictive covenants in determining whether such mechanisms provide sufficient site protection.” Site protection





templates may be found under “Compensatory Mitigation” on the following website:  
<https://www.lrd.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Tennessee/>

## Preservation

51. **Question:** Will the 50% limit rule on preservation be enforced or can banks have more than 50% of credits generated from preservation reaches?

**Answer:** There is no limitation on the amount of preservation that may be proposed or awarded.

52. **Question:** Will NFWF accept proposed preservation projects on public land?

**Answer:** Projects may be sited on public or private lands. SMFT funds are eligible for funding compensatory mitigation projects that produce credits on public land. However, the credit generation must be based solely on aquatic resource functions provided by the compensatory mitigation project, over and above those provided by public programs already planned or in place (33 C.F.R. § 332.3(a)(3)).

SMFT funds are eligible for funding preservation-only projects that meet the following criteria (33 C.F.R. § 332.3(h)):

- The resources to be preserved provide important physical, chemical, or biological functions for the watershed;
- The resources to be preserved contribute significantly to the ecological sustainability of the watershed;
- Preservation is determined by the district engineer to be appropriate and practicable;
- The resources are under threat of destruction or adverse modifications; and
- The preserved site will be permanently protected through an appropriate real estate or other legal instrument.

## Crediting/Ratios

53. **Question:** For a mitigation bank with an approved MBI or prospectus, what information will the selection committee need to convert SQT credits to ratio credits?

**Answer:** General guidelines for converting SQT credits to ratio-based credits are provided in the attached *Conversion Table*.

54. **Question:** Is there an accepted or preferred methodology to convert SQT bank credits to ratio credits and propose released credits from existing SQT banks?

**Answer:** General guidelines for converting SQT credits to ratio-based credits are provided in the attached *Conversion Table*.

55. **Question:** If a provider has a modern era (SQT) existing TN mitigation bank (with un-contracted credits available), would these credits be able to be applied to this potential RFP? i.e. could SQT credits be converted to 2004 ratio credits in this instance?



**Answer:** General guidelines for converting SQT credits to ratio-based credits are provided in the attached *Conversion Table*.

56. **Question:** To be clear, the 2004 Stream Mitigation Guidelines is the guidance to be used in determining mitigation credit and not the SQT?

**Answer:** Applicants should adhere to the credit ratios provided in Appendix B of the RFP.

57. **Question:** The public notices states “The SMFT will be applied to appropriate stream compensatory mitigation projects, activities, and related expenses as approved by the USACE, in consultation with the Interagency Review Team, in accordance with the 2008 Final Rule on Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources (33 CFR Parts 325 and 332; 40 CFR Part 230) and the 2004 Stream Mitigation Guidelines for the State of Tennessee.” Can we assume that all 2004 guidance/rules apply? Including 3 – 5 yr monitoring period (Level 1 – 3), credit ratio production (replacement 1:1, restoration 1.5:1, etc.)? We want to make sure all of the 2004 rules apply.

**Answer:** Applicants should adhere to the credit ratios provided in Appendix B of the RFP. Monitoring is expected to occur for 5 years, unless additional monitoring is warranted (i.e., monitoring is extended due to the site failing to meet performance standards).

58. **Question:** Will there be a 5% stream credit lift if riparian wetlands are restored within the stream buffers?

**Answer:** The use of an enhanced credit ratio of 1.25:1 will be considered for stream reaches proposed for in-stream restoration, with adjacent wetland enhancement or restoration along the reach. This ratio would only apply to the portion of the stream with adjacent wetlands.

59. **Question:** Given the reduced risk of stream enhancement projects, will the advanced credit release schedule as per Regulatory Guidance Letter 19-01 be an option for proposed mitigation bank projects?

**Answer:** No.

60. **Question:** In terms of stream crediting, what considerations will be given to projects that include a dam removal component? The RFP mentions crediting the removal of culverts and concrete lined channels at 1:1 for replacement. Will impounded reaches upstream from a removed dam also be credited at 1:1 for replacement?

**Answer:** For general guidance on how to credit dam removal projects, see attached *Dam Removal Compensatory Mitigation Potential* tables.

61. **Question:** Will monitoring protocols utilize SQT or the legacy methodology of ratio credit projects?

**Answer:** Monitoring protocols and performance standards should be developed specific to and appropriate for the proposed mitigation project.

62. **Question:** In the RFP Narrative Application, II.1J(v) (pg. 5/11) describes the section for credit ratio justification. Is the applicant encouraged to suggest mitigation ratios that differ from the pre-determined ratios in Appendix B?



**Answer:** Applicants should adhere to the pre-determined Mitigation Ratios provided in Appendix B of the RFP and addressed in the Q&As. In terms of justification, applicants should provide an explanation of how the proposed mitigation activities for each stream reach meets the description of the proposed Treatment (i.e., the footnotes in the Table in Appendix B).

63. **Question:** The wording now is that high-quality ephemerals will receive the same ratio of credits as perennial and intermittent. Is this correct?

**Answer:** Applicants should adhere to the pre-determined Mitigation Ratios provided in Appendix B of the RFP, which do not differentiate between flow regimes. In terms of justification, applicants should provide an explanation of how the proposed mitigation activities for each stream reach meets the description of the proposed Treatment (i.e., the

footnotes in the Table in Appendix B). Mitigation proposals should be appropriate, ecologically suitable, and technically feasible in relation to the quality and condition of the individual stream. No more than 15% of the total mitigation project credits can be generated from ephemeral streams.

#### Technical

64. **Question:** SQT LWD is moving away from index and now utilizing to number of pieces. Can proposals also follow that guidance?

**Answer:** Attachment C to the RFP (*Existing and Proposed Reach Level Stream Function-Based Rapid Assessment*) evaluates large woody debris by number of pieces.

## Dam Removal Compensatory Mitigation Potential Tables

Dam Removal Compensatory Mitigation Potential				
Site protection length of impoundment	Stream		Current Stream State	Proposed Stream State
	Functional Group	Assessment Parameter		
	<b>Dam Removal with a restored channel 1.1:1</b>	Hydrology	Flow Regime/Hydrologic Connectivity	NF-FAR
		Hydraulics	Floodplain	NF-FAR
		Geomorphology	Riparian	NF-FAR
			Bedform Diversity	NF-FAR
			Lateral Stability	NF-FAR
		Biology	Biology	NF
		Physiochemical	Water Quality	NF-FAR
			Watershed Assessment	F-G
	<b>Dam Removal with stream rehabilitation 1.33:1</b>	Hydrology	Flow Regime/Hydrologic Connectivity	NF-FAR
		Hydraulics	Floodplain	NF-FAR
		Geomorphology	Riparian	NF-FAR
			Bedform Diversity	NF-FAR
			Lateral Stability	NF-FAR
		Biology	Biology	NF
		Physiochemical	Water Quality	NF-FAR
			Watershed Assessment	F-G
	<b>Dam Removal with in-stream enhancement 1.5:1</b>  Riparian vegetation already established	Hydrology	Flow Regime/Hydrologic Connectivity	NF-FAR
		Hydraulics	Floodplain	NF-FAR
		Geomorphology	Riparian	F
			Bedform Diversity	NF-FAR
			Lateral Stability	NF-FAR
		Biology	Biology	NF
		Physiochemical	Water Quality	NF-F
			Watershed Assessment	F-G



NFWF

Site protection length of  
impoundment

Dam Removal Compensatory Mitigation Potential				
Stream Functional Group Assessment Parameter			Current Stream State	Proposed Stream State
<b>Dam Removal with full site protection the length of the impoundment</b>  2.5:1	Hydrology	Flow Regime/Hydrologic Connectivity	NF-FAR	F
	Hydraulics	Floodplain	NF-FAR	Any
	Geomorphology	Riparian	NF-FAR	Any
		Bedform Diversity	NF-FAR	Any
		Lateral Stability	NF-FAR	F
	Biology	Biology	NF	Optional
	Physiochemical	Water Quality	NF-F	Optional
		Watershed Assessment	F-G	
<b>Dam Removal with site protection at the structure location only</b>  4:1	Hydrology	Flow Regime/Hydrologic Connectivity	NF-FAR	F
	Hydraulics	Floodplain	NF-FAR	Any
	Geomorphology	Riparian	Any	Any
		Bedform Diversity	NF-FAR	Any
		Lateral Stability	NF-FAR	F
	Biology	Biology	NF	Optional
	Physiochemical	Water Quality	NF-F	Optional
		Watershed Assessment	F-G	

## Conversion Table

Mitigation Functional Crosswalk - April 2016 (rev. 09-19)				
Mitigation Potential	Stream Functional Group	Assessment Parameter	Current Stream State (Measured)	Proposed Stream State (At a minimum)
<b>Restoration</b> Up To 1.5:1	Hydrology	Runoff		
	Hydraulics	Floodplain	NF-FAR*	F
	Geomorphology	Riparian	NF-FAR*	F
		Bedform Diversity	NF-FAR*	F
		Lateral Stability	NF-FAR*	F
	Biology	Biology	Impaired	optional
	Physiochemical	Water Quality	FAR-F	optional
		Watershed Assessment	Fair-Good	not affected
		Channel Evolution Model	NF, or justify trend to NF	F
* Provide evidence of trend to NF for any parameter that is measured as FAR				
<b>Rehabilitation/Enhancement II</b> Up To 3:1	Hydrology	Runoff		
	Hydraulics	Floodplain*	NF-FAR	FAR-F
	Geomorphology	Riparian*	NF-FAR	F
		Bedform Diversity*	NF-FAR	FAR-F
		Lateral Stability*	NF	F
	Biology	Biology	NF-FAR	optional
	Physiochemical	Water Quality	FAR-F	optional
		Watershed Assessment	Fair-Good	not affected
		Channel Evolution Model	NF-FAR	F
*All of these assessment parameters must be lifted at least one functional category				
<b>Enhancement I</b> 4:1-6:1	Hydrology	Runoff		
	Hydraulics	Floodplain	FAR-F	
	Geomorphology	Riparian*	NF-FAR	FAR-F
		Bedform Diversity*	NF-FAR	FAR-F
		Lateral Stability*	NF-FAR	FAR-F
	Biology	Biology	Any	
	Physiochemical	Water Quality	Any	
		Watershed Assessment	Any	not affected
		Channel Evolution Model	Any	Any
*If any of these parameters are NF in current state, proposed mitigation must address that parameter				
*At least one of these assessment parameters must be lifted one functional category. Multiple parameter lift may increase credit ratio.				
F = Functioning FAR = Functioning-At-Risk NF = Not Functioning Impaired = Benthic TMI score of <32, or Biorecon <9				