



# 2021 Critical Areas and Shoreline Monitoring & Adaptive Management Online Workshops



Welcome to

Proposed Indicators for Evaluating The Effectiveness of CAOs



2021 Critical Areas and Shoreline Monitoring & Adaptive Management Online Workshops





# 2021 Critical Areas and Shoreline Monitoring & Adaptive Management Online Workshops



This project has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency under assistance agreement PC-01J2230116-05251 through the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.









#### Meet Your Presenters



Keith Folkerts is currently leading WDFW's efforts to convey agency information about Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) to local governments in support of their regulatory efforts under the Growth Management Act and Shoreline Management Act. During his 7 years at WDFW, he has worked on PHS riparian management recommendations and High Resolution Change Detection, served as a member of the Voluntary Stewardship Program Technical Panel, and has been the project manager for several grants with the Puget Sound Partnership. Prior to working for WDFW, Keith worked for Kitsap County in the Department of Community Development, Public Works Department, and Commissioners Office in positions that included Watershed Planner, Stream Team Coordinator, and Natural Resources Coordinator.

Prior to working for Kitsap County, Keith served as Surface Warfare Officer, including deployments to the Arabian Gulf during the Gulf War. Keith has BA in political science from the US Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. Outside of work, Keith enjoys backpacking, kayaking, gardening, and trying to keep up with his three daughters and marathon-running wife.

## Welcome to Webinar #10 of 11!

Proposed indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of CAOs







## Our CAO performance indicators rely on HRCD. What is HRCD?

- Compares aerial images (2 time periods)
- Computer IDs places that have changed
- Person confirms & IDs cause of change
  - Development, tree removal, forestry, other (stream meanders, landslides, fires...)
- Results: Change polygons
  - Canopy cover loss, new imperviousness...
  - As small as 1 large tree; 3 small trees
- All of Puget Sound; Five time periods for
  First: 2006-09; Most recent: 2015-17
- \$Millions to produce; free to you





# <section-header>





## What is an "Effective" CAO?

## What is an Effective CAO Performance Indicator?

The CAO's Job The Performance Indicators' Job Characteristics of an effective CAO Performance Indicator



# What is the job of the CAO?

- Avoid, minimize, offset harmful activities within Critical Areas
  - Avoid = Shift activity out of Critical Area
  - **Minimize** = Do as little of the harmful activities as possible
  - **Offset** = Make improvements in proportion to the un-avoided harm
  - "Harmful activities"
    - Adding imperviousness
    - Removing trees
    - Adding pollutants; fragmenting habitats, introducing invasive species, hardening stream banks...



#### An "effective" CAO

- Avoids adverse changes to critical areas
  - By shifting development
- Minimizes adverse change within critical areas.
- Ensures offsets for unavoidable harm sufficient to achieve no net loss of ecological functions.





#### An "Effective" CAO

- Avoids adverse changes to critical areas by shifting development
- Minimizes adverse change within critical areas.
- Ensures offsets for unavoidable harm sufficient to achieve no net loss of ecological functions.

#### An Ideal CAO Performance Indicator

Provides context and insights

#### What is "normal"? How urgent, important is this? Where to dig deeper?

#### An "Effective" CAO

- Avoids adverse changes to critical areas by shifting development
- Minimizes adverse change within critical areas.
- Ensures offsets for unavoidable harm sufficient to achieve no net loss of ecological functions.

### An Ideal CAO Performance Indicator What is "normal"? What is "normal"? How urgent, important is this? What is "normal"? What is "normal"? How urgent, important is this? Where to dig deeper? Quantifies extent to which development is shifted out of critical areas

#### An "Effective" CAO

- Avoids adverse changes to critical areas by shifting development
- Minimizes adverse change within critical areas.
- Ensures offsets for unavoidable harm sufficient to achieve no net loss of ecological functions.

#### An Ideal CAO Performance Indicator

Provides context and insights

-<u>Q</u>-

What is "normal"? How urgent, important is this? Where to dig deeper?

Quantifies extent to which development is **shifted** out of critical areas

Quantifies extent to which change occurs in critical areas

#### An "Effective" CAO

- Avoids adverse changes to critical areas by shifting development
- Minimizes adverse change within critical areas.
- Ensures offsets for unavoidable harm sufficient to achieve no net loss of ecological functions.



#### An "Effective" CAO

- Avoids adverse changes to critical areas by shifting development
- Minimizes adverse change within critical areas.
- Ensures offsets for unavoidable harm sufficient to achieve no net loss of ecological functions.





#### How to Measure "Avoidance"?

- To measure "avoidance", we need to know the difference in the rate of change *within* Critical Areas vs the rate of change *outside of* Critical Areas
  - If a CAO is supposed to avoid development within Critical Areas (shifting it into Non-Critical Areas), to know its effectiveness we need to know both.
  - Knowing the rate of change outside of Critical Areas also adds context





#### Conveying the Idea of "Shift"

- 1. "For every 10 acres of change outside of critical areas, how much change happened within Critical Areas?"
- 2. "For every acre of change within a critical area, how many acres of change happened outside of critical areas?"

#### Both of these questions

- Provide an easy way to simultaneously consider the two rates
- Self-adjust for the community's overall growth rate





- Only count what is under the jurisdiction's control
  - No lumping cities and counties
  - No holding local jurisdiction to account for federal, tribal, or state actions
  - No penalizing the jurisdiction when a river, wildfire or landslide takes out some tree
- Exclude all surface water from the calculations



#### Things we Kept in Mind when Developing CAO Performance Indicators

- You decide your benchmarks
- How much development in your critical areas is acceptable?
- We can help you figure out ways to measure indicators, but you have the authority establish local goals





Four Performance Indicators



#### 5 Indicators to Measure CAO Effectiveness

One looks at the <b>current</b> state (2017)	
Two indicators look at <b>rates of change</b> and <b>trends since 2006</b>	and the second s
One <b>looks ahead</b> a decade, showing results of recent trends continuing	2
One reports on the <b>shifting</b> of development	
One reports <b>how much change</b> occurred within critical areas	
Results are provided as absolute numbers and normalized	

#### Indicator Examples Use Soundwide Results

To explain these indicators, we use actual results from our analysis of change within urban and rural CAO-defined stream buffers

- All 12 Puget Sound Counties, 10 cities
- Averages for all UGAs and all rural (non-UGA) areas
- More on the specific geography in the demo
- NTA's final report has more details





#### Indicator #2

- Portion of Critical Area trees that will be lost in a decade at recent rate (red slice)
- Soundwide riparian averages
  - Urban Areas: 0.36% canopy loss per decade
  - Rural Areas: 0.17% canopy loss per decade



#### Indicator #3

- Acres of change per year in Critical Areas
  - Total change and canopy change
- Soundwide total change averages (2006-2017)
  - Urban Areas: 0.53 ac change per 1,000 ac of riparian area
  - Rural Areas: 0.20 ac change per 1,000 ac of riparian area

Total Change (Canopy Loss + Impervious Gain) within CAO Minimum Buffers Soundwide















## Demonstration: Information Available from WDFW

Robin Hale, Landscape Analytics Section, WDFW



Project background and data High Resolution Change Detection (HRCD)

#### **Project background**

WDFW Mandate:

"*Preserve, protect, perpetuate, and manage*" fish and wildlife (RCW 77.04.012)

USDA National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP)

Department of Fish and Wildlife

Salmon Recovery Funding Board













29











Option 2: Data Request Form	Project Description* Please briefly describe your project and intended use for the data you are requesting. My data will be amazing
<ul> <li>Currently for:</li> <li>Tree canopy</li> <li>Visible Surface water</li> <li>Changes (outside of Puget sound)</li> </ul>	pr7 Contact Information Mame* Robin Hale Cmail* Cobin.hale@dfw.wa.gov Phone
Department of Fish and Wildlife	64





## How to Calculate the Four Performance Indicators

A demonstration using a fictitious Puget Sound city























## Thanks for attending. Contact me if you want to calculate your indicators!

#### **Keith Folkerts**

CONSERVATION INFORMATION DELIVERY UNIT MANAGER

keith.Folkerts@dfw.wa.gov 360-902-2390 (desk); 360-878-4230 (cell)

