

**EXHIBIT G**  
**CREDITING AND DEBITING PROCEDURES**

I. IRT-Approved Assessment Methodology

A. Stream Credits

The number of Potential Credits for stream compensatory mitigation will be determined by the IRT, using the Unified Stream Methodology (USM).

B. Wetland Credits

The number of Potential Credits for wetland compensatory mitigation will be determined using the IRT-approved credit ratios in the table below. Each acre of land area within the Bank or Bank Phase shall be designated as to which types of land forms, as classified by the Cowardin System, shall be restored, created, enhanced, or preserved. Approved credit ratios will then be applied to each wetland acreage or wetland mitigation type to derive the amount of wetland mitigation credits for the Bank or Phase.

II. Timing of Determination of Potential Credits

A. Conceptual Mitigation Work Plan (CMWP)

The IRT will initially determine the total number of compensatory mitigation Credits generated by this Bank, by applying the methodologies described in Section I above to the Sponsor's proposed establishment, restoration, or preservation work described in the CMWP for each Bank or Phase. Nothing in the MBI or this exhibit entitles the Sponsor to an increase in the number of Potential Credits generated by the Bank after the MBI is approved.

B. Final Mitigation Work Plan (FMWP)

If IRT finds that application of the IRT-Approved Assessment Methodology to the FMWP yields fewer Credits than determined based on the CMWP, the IRT may decrease the Bank's number of Potential Credits.

The Sponsor may request that the IRT reevaluate the number of Potential Credits based on the Sponsor's FMWP. If the IRT concludes that application of the assessment methodology or methodologies described in Section I above demonstrate a greater difference between pre- and post-compensatory mitigation project site conditions than was indicated at the time of MBI approval, the IRT may increase the number of Potential Credits in accordance with the findings of the updated assessment.

C. As-Built Reports

If IRT finds that application of the IRT-Approved Assessment Methodology to the as-built report yields fewer Credits than determined based on the FMWP, the IRT may decrease the Bank's number of Potential Credits.

The Sponsor may request that the IRT reevaluate the number of Potential Credits based on the Sponsor's as-built report. If the IRT concludes that application of the assessment methodology or methodologies described in Section I above demonstrate a greater difference between pre- and post-compensatory mitigation project site conditions than was indicated at the time of MBI approval, the IRT may increase the number of Potential Credits in accordance with the findings of the updated assessment.

2017 DRAFT

**WETLAND RATIOS & CREDITS\*\*\*\***

<b>Proposed mitigation activity</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>Proposed Credit</b>
<b>Wetland Restoration (Reestablishment)</b>		1 : 1	
<b>Wetland Creation (Establishment)</b>		2 : 1	
<b>Wetland Enhancement (Rehabilitation) -</b> Upper range (e.g. hydrology & vegetative enhancement with high increase in function)		5 : 1	
<b>Wetland Enhancement (Rehabilitation) -</b> Lower range (e.g. control INU species, or activities partially addressing function)		7 : 1	
<b>Wetland Preservation</b> (can be adjusted higher or lower depending upon condition or function of wetland)		10 : 1	
<b>Upland Buffer Restoration/Enhancement-</b> (Protection and function through vegetative restoration/enhancement and INU species management - 200 – 400 stems/acre)		12-15 : 1	
<b>Upland Buffer Preservation**</b>		20 : 1	
<b>Other - add intermediate values here</b>			
<b>Sum</b>			
<b>***Percent of credits involving restoration or creation</b>			

\*For the Enhancement or Upland Buffer categories these ranges are based upon what is proposed and how it is related to improving or protecting wetland function. This table contains the general limits of the ranges; however intermediate values may be proposed based upon the specific project.

\*\*Buffer width must be a minimum of 100 feet. Credit for any buffer beyond the 100 feet is determined on a case by case basis.

\*\*\*This excludes all preservation, enhancement and any upland buffer credits

\*\*\*\*Acreage and credits are subject to change based on the results of the as-built report, boundary surveys, delineations, and monitoring reports.

**STREAM CREDITS \***

<b>Proposed mitigation activity</b>	<b>Linear Feet/Acres</b>	<b>Improvement Credit</b>	<b>Preservation Credit</b>
<b>Stream Restoration (LF)</b>			
<b>Stream Enhancement with Instream Structures (LF)</b>			
<b>Stream Enhancement (LF)</b>			
<b>Riparian Areas – Preservation (LF and/or Ac)</b>			
<b>Riparian Areas – Enhancement/Restoration (Ac)</b>			
<b>Livestock exclusion AF (LF)</b>			
<b>Watershed AF</b>			
<b>T&amp;E AF – Restoration/Enhancement</b>			
<b>T&amp;E AF – Preservation</b>			
<b>Sum</b>			
<b>** Percent of credits involving restoration or enhancement and/or livestock exclusion</b>			

\*Linear feet and credits are subject to change based on the results of the as-built report, Boundary surveys, delineations, and monitoring reports

\*\*This excludes all preservation credits