

**Seattle Critical Areas Monitoring and Adaptive Management Workshop – 2/27/2018
Breakout Notes**

Challenges of Critical Areas Monitoring

Below are the potential challenges of critical areas monitoring that were generated by participants in addition to those identified in earlier workshops (see slide #9 of Critical Areas Monitoring Overview presentation)

- Staff turnover – transfer of knowledge
- Public’s lack of understanding of what we are monitoring
- Blend of quantity and quality
- Need to identify indicators/performance standards – what are you measuring?
- Don’t want to know errors, liabilities due to political vulnerability

What questions would you like to answer by monitoring critical areas?

- Overall effectiveness of mitigation sequencing and compensatory mitigation
- Some functions are better protected – imbalances over time?
- Consultant time/developer budget?
- How does the critical area function after monitoring ends?
- Are the results something that can be acted upon?
- How do you bin the metrics – poor, fair, good?
- With a statewide variance of buffers, how do you do effectiveness monitoring?

Existing Monitoring Efforts

Levels of Monitoring		
Permit Implementation Monitoring	Permit Effectiveness Monitoring	Ecological Validation Monitoring
Kitsap County – project monitoring	King County – 5-year study/trends of environmental response – 6 treatment and 3 control watersheds	Seattle – Seattle Public Utility – Stream water quality
Seattle – 5 year project monitoring	Bellevue – 5 years of monitoring & inspection	Bellevue – Stream monitoring
Mercer Island – 5 year monitoring		
Monroe - 5 year monitoring		
Bremerton – 5 year monitoring		
Tukwila – Project monitoring		

Final Breakout – Further Challenges

- In the application process, it is hard to enforce avoidance of impacts due to political pressures
- Challenging to choose the right indicators
- Lack of coordination with master builders and others – lack of understanding
- Goal of net gain versus regulatory no net loss - sens