# VSP 5 Year Report for Skagit County

**Report Period Ending:** 01/20/2021

Submitter Name	Kara Symonds
Submitter Phone	(360) 416-1447
Submitter Email	karas@co.skagit.wa.us

Has the county work group approved the content and submittal of this report? Ves 🗌 No

Date of Approval

01/15/2021

#### **PROTECTION Goals**

- ✓ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years.
- □ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years.

#### **ENHANCEMENT Goals**

- ✓ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years.
- □ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years.

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas water quality and quantity for supplyin potable water for human use. No degra	, and well-head areas, ground and surface g all needs within Skagit County, including dation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect are 2011 baseline of Group A water system	as, no degradation below the statutory water quality.	1 - Nooksack
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	<u>Status</u>
No degradation below baseline year	Submitted a public records request to obtain and review Consumer Confidence Reports from the Washington State Department of Health for Group A Water Systems in Skagit County. Compared the 2011 and 2018 reports for all reported analytes included in the individual Consumer Confidence Reports.	

#### Benchmark Met? Comments

Adaptive Management?

✓ No

🗌 Yes

✓ Yes □ No Benchmark was shown to be achieved by obtaining and

analyzing Group A water system Consumer Confidence Reports from the Washington State Department of Health for years 2011 and 2018. 42 responsive records were returned for 2011 and 44 were returned for 2018. There were two pre-treated violations for coliform in 2011 and no violations for any agricultural markers in the 2018 reports. Agricultural markers included coliform, nitrate, herbicide/pesticides, and volatile organic compounds. The methodology was consistent in all Water Resource Inventory Areas.

Benchmark Monitoring	<b>Monitoring</b>	sufficient?
The benchmark is being monitored by obtaining and reviewing all Consumer Confidence Reports within Skagit County. The monitoring methodology was consistent through all Water Resource Inventory Areas. The Consumer Confidence Reports were geo-referenced by zoning and broken down by all reported analytes. While obtaining the Consumer Confidence Reports, the Washington State Department of Health suggested supplementing the Consumer Confidence Report data with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) database. WSDOH stated this data is refreshed quarterly for all public water systems. This data source will be added, in addition to obtaining Group A Water System Consumer Confidence Reports, for future five-year reports. As noted in the Work Plan, if a contamination is found and believed to be due to agricultural activity, the County will work with the Washington State Department of Agriculture and agricultural operators in the drainage area on addressing the violation.	<b>∨</b> γes □	No
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground a water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit Count	and surface y, including	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 20.	LI baseline.	
2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality.	statutory	1 - Nooksack
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment		<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Frequently Flooded	
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality.	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment		<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A
Coole 1. Durate at a wifey we show a surger and well have a surger and and any face.	Coologia Usegard	
water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality.	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment		<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface	Wetlands	
potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.		
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality.	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment		<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Sta	tus
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality.		3 - Lower Skagit - San	nish
water quality and quantity for supplying al potable water for human use. No degradat			
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, an	<b>Critical Aquifer Recha</b>	irge	

No degradation below baseline year

Benchmark was shown to be achieved by obtaining and analyzing Group A water system Consumer Confidence Reports from the Washington State Department of Health for years 2011 and 2018. 42 responsive records were returned for 2011 and 44 were returned for 2018. There were two pre-treated violations for coliform in 2011 and no violations for any agricultural markers in the 2018 reports. Agricultural markers included coliform, nitrate, herbicide/pesticides, and volatile organic compounds. The

methodology was consistent in all Water Resource

Submitted a public records request to obtain and review Met Consumer Confidence Reports from the Washington State Department of Health for Group A Water Systems in Skagit County. Compared the 2011 and 2018 reports for all reported analytes included in the individual Consumer Confidence Reports.

#### **Benchmark Met?** Comments

#### **Adaptive Management?**

Yes

✓ No

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark is being monitored by obtaining and reviewing all Consumer Confidence Reports within Skagit County. The monitoring methodology was consistent through all Water Resource Inventory Areas. The Consumer Confidence Reports were geo-referenced by zoning and broken down by all reported analytes. While obtaining the Consumer Confidence Reports, the Washington State Department of Health suggested supplementing the Consumer Confidence Report data with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) database. WSDOH stated this data is refreshed guarterly for all public water systems. This data source will be added, in addition to obtaining Group A Water System Consumer Confidence Reports, for future five-year reports. As noted in the Work Plan, if a contamination is found and believed to be due to agricultural activity, the County will work with the Washington State Department of Agriculture and agricultural operators in the drainage area on addressing the violation.

Inventory Areas.

#### **Monitoring sufficient?**

✓ Yes

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory		Fish and Wildlife Habitat 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
2011 baseline of Group A water system wa	ter quality.		
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, an water quality and quantity for supplying all potable water for human use. No degradat	d well-head areas, ground and surface I needs within Skagit County, including ion below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Frequently Flooded	
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, 2011 baseline of Group A water system wa	no degradation below the statutory ter quality.	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, an water quality and quantity for supplying all potable water for human use. No degradat Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, 2011 baseline of Group A water system wa	d well-head areas, ground and surface I needs within Skagit County, including ion below the statutory 2011 baseline. no degradation below the statutory ter quality.	Geologic Hazard 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, an water quality and quantity for supplying all potable water for human use. No degradat Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, 2011 baseline of Group A water system wa	d well-head areas, ground and surface I needs within Skagit County, including ion below the statutory 2011 baseline. no degradation below the statutory ter quality.	Wetlands 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, water quality and quantity for supplying potable water for human use. No degra	Critical Aquifer Re	echarge	
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect are 2011 baseline of Group A water system	4 - Upper Skagit		
Strategy/Metric Description	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u>
No degradation below baseline year	Requested, obtained, and reviewed Consumer Confidence Reports from the Washington State		Met

Benchmark Met? Comments

🗹 Yes

Department of Health for Group A Water Systems in Skagit County. There was no degradation below the baseline for Group A water systems for water quality parameters directly applicable to agricultural activities.

> Adaptive Management? □ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark was shown to be achieved by obtaining and analyzing Group A water system Consumer Confidence Reports from the Washington State Department of Health for years 2011 and 2018. 42 responsive records were returned for 2011 and 44 were returned for 2018. There were two pre-treated violations for coliform in 2011 and no violations for any agricultural markers in the 2018 reports. Agricultural markers included coliform, nitrate, herbicide/pesticides, and volatile organic compounds. The methodology was consistent in all Water Resource Inventory Areas.

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark is being monitored by obtaining and reviewing all Consumer Confidence Reports within Skagit County. The monitoring methodology was consistent through all Water Resource Inventory Areas. The Consumer Confidence Reports were geo-referenced by zoning and broken down by all reported analytes. While obtaining the Consumer Confidence Reports, the Washington State Department of Health suggested supplementing the Consumer Confidence Report data with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) database. WSDOH stated this data is refreshed guarterly for all public water systems. This data source will be added, in addition to obtaining Group A Water System Consumer Confidence Reports, for future five-year reports. As noted in the Work Plan, if a contamination is found and believed to be due to agricultural activity, the County will work with the Washington State Department of Agriculture and agricultural operators in the drainage area on addressing the violation.

#### **Monitoring sufficient?**

✓ Yes □ No

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including	Fish and Wildlife Habitat	
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality.	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentGoal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.Critical Area.	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Frequently Flooded	
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water guality.	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Description     Accomplishment       Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this     Critical Area.	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality	Geologic Hazard 4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Description     Accomplishment       Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this     Critical Area.	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Wetlands	
Benchmark: 1 - Within the intersect areas, no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline of Group A water system water quality.	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Description     Accomplishment       Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this     Critical Area.	<u>Status</u> N/A	

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, a populations and their associated habitats. I 2011 baseline.	Critical Aquifer Recharge	
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, a of July 22, 2011, within the standard distan	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife		Fish and Wildlife	Habitat
populations and their associated habitat 2011 baseline.	s. No degradation below the statutory		
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect area	as, no net loss of riparian buffer existing as	1 - Nooksack	
of July 22, 2011, within the standard dis	tances prescribed for each water type.		
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment		<u>Status</u>
No net loss of riparian buffer from the statutory baseline	AccomplishmenteIn order to monitor change in riparian areas, Skagit County first updated waterbody locations for the Nation Hydrography Dataset through the Department of Ecolog Next a GIS layer of the VSP project area was developed i 		Met
Benchmark Met? Comments	Ada	ptive Managemer	nt?

✓ Yes □ No Benchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the statutory baseline was shown to be achieved through aerial photo interpretation and analysis. Skagit County obtains high resolution aerial photography from EagleView (formerly Pictometry) every two years since 2007. A GIS layer of the VSP project area was created, and all areas within the VSP Project Area were investigated for years 2011, 2017, and 2019. There was no net loss of riparian buffer from the statutory baseline through 2019 within WRIA 1.	☐ Yes	✓ No

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the statutory baseline is being monitored through high resolution aerial photo interpretation and analysis. First, waterbodies in the VSP Intersect Area were corrected and that data was updated with the Department of Ecology to be incorporated into the National Hydrography Dataset. Next, the regulated waterbodies were buffered with a GIS polygon based on standard buffer distances by water type. This area was monitored for change from the 2011 to 2017/2019 aerial photos. Skagit County receives these aerial photos every two years and will continue to use this data for change detection. This can also be supplemented with NOAA land coverages once the 1 meter land cover data becomes available.

#### **Monitoring sufficient?**

✓ Yes 🗆 No

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife populations and their associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.		Frequently Flooded	
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, of July 22, 2011, within the standard distan	no net loss of riparian buffer existing as aces prescribed for each water type.	1 - Nooksack	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Critical Area.			
Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, a populations and their associated habitats. 2011 baseline.	nd enhance fish and wildlife No degradation below the statutory	Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, of July 22, 2011, within the standard distan	no net loss of riparian buffer existing as nees prescribed for each water type.	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, a	nd enhance fish and wildlife	Wetlands	
2011 baseline. Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas,	no net loss of riparian buffer existing as	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, a populations and their associated habitats. 2011 baseline.	nd enhance fish and wildlife No degradation below the statutory	Critical Aquifer Ro	echarge
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, of July 22, 2011, within the standard distant	no net loss of riparian buffer existing as aces prescribed for each water type.	3 - Lower Skagit -	Samish
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Accomplishment		<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlifeFish and Wildlife Habitatpopulations and their associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory2011 baseline.

Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of riparian buffer existing as 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish of July 22, 2011, within the standard distances prescribed for each water type.

# Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentStatusNo net loss of riparian buffer from the<br/>statutory baselineIn order to monitor change in riparian areas, SkagitMetCounty first updated waterbody locations for the National<br/>Hydrography Dataset through the Department of Ecology.<br/>Next a GIS layer of the VSP project area was developed in<br/>order to define the extent of the monitoring. The<br/>monitored project area contains all regulated<br/>waterbodies in Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones buffered in a

Benchmark Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive	Management?
¥ Yes □ No	Benchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the statutory baseline was shown to be achieved through aerial photo interpretation and analysis. Skagit County obtains high resolution aerial photography from EagleView (formerly Pictometry) every two years since 2007. A GIS layer of the VSP project area was created, and all areas within the VSP Project Area were investigated for years 2011, 2017, and 2019. There was no net loss of riparian buffer from the statutory baseline through 2019 within WRIA 3.	□ Yes	✓ No

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the statutory baseline is being monitored through high resolution aerial photo interpretation and analysis. First, waterbodies in the VSP Intersect Area were corrected and that data was updated with the Department of Ecology to be incorporated into the National Hydrography Dataset. Next, the regulated waterbodies were buffered with a GIS polygon based on standard buffer distances by water type. This area was monitored for change from the 2011 to 2017/2019 aerial photos. Skagit County receives these aerial photos every two years and will continue to use this data for change detection. This can also be supplemented with NOAA land coverages once the 1 meter land cover data becomes available.

#### Monitoring sufficient?

🗹 Yes 🛛 🗆 No

GIS layer at the standard CAO width (Type S = 200 ft, Type

monitored area were classified as either Shrub or Tree for

photography. Approximately 17,338 acres were assessed.

F = 150 ft and Type N= 50 ft). The vegetation in this

the 2011 and both the 2017 and 2019 aerial

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, a	Frequently Flooded		
2011 baseline.			
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, of July 22, 2011, within the standard dista	3 - Lower Skagit -	Samish	
Strategy/Metric Description	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.			N/A
Goal: 2 Drotact roctors where practical	and onbanco fich and wildlife	Goologic Hazard	
populations and their associated habitats. 2011 baseline.	No degradation below the statutory	Geologic Hazaru	
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, of July 22, 2011, within the standard dista	no net loss of riparian buffer existing as nees prescribed for each water type.	3 - Lower Skagit -	Samish
Strategy/Metric Description	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.			N/A
Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, a populations and their associated habitats. 2011 baseline.	No degradation below the statutory	Wetlands	
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, of July 22, 2011, within the standard dista	no net loss of riparian buffer existing as nces prescribed for each water type.	3 - Lower Skagit -	Samish
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment		<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.			N/A
Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, a populations and their associated habitats. 2011 baseline.	and enhance fish and wildlife No degradation below the statutory	Critical Aquifer Re	charge
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, of July 22, 2011, within the standard dista	no net loss of riparian buffer existing as nces prescribed for each water type.	4 - Upper Skagit	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Critical Area.			

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife<br/>populations and their associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory<br/>2011 baseline.Fish and Wildlife HabitatBenchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of riparian buffer existing as<br/>of July 22, 2011, within the standard distances prescribed for each water type.4 - Upper SkagitStrategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentStatus

<u> </u>		
No net loss of riparian buffer from the statutory baseline	<ul> <li>In order to monitor change in riparian areas, Skagit</li> <li>County first updated waterbody locations for the National</li> <li>Hydrography Dataset through the Department of Ecology.</li> <li>Next a GIS layer of the VSP project area was developed in order to define the extent of the monitoring. The monitored project area contains all regulated</li> <li>waterbodies in Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones buffered in a GIS layer at the standard CAO width (Type S = 200 ft, Type F = 150 ft and Type N= 50 ft). The vegetation in this monitored area were classified as either Shrub or Tree for the 2011 and both the 2017 and 2019 aerial photography. Approximately 17,338 acres were assessed.</li> </ul>	Met

<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive	Management?
enchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the catutory baseline was shown to be achieved through erial photo interpretation and analysis. Skagit County btains high resolution aerial photography from agleView (formerly Pictometry) every two years since 007. A GIS layer of the VSP project area was created, and II areas within the VSP Project Area were investigated for ears 2011, 2017, and 2019. There was no net loss of parian buffer from the statutory baseline through 2019 vithin WRIA 4.	□ Yes	✓ No
	omments enchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the atutory baseline was shown to be achieved through erial photo interpretation and analysis. Skagit County otains high resolution aerial photography from agleView (formerly Pictometry) every two years since 007. A GIS layer of the VSP project area was created, and I areas within the VSP Project Area were investigated for ears 2011, 2017, and 2019. There was no net loss of barian buffer from the statutory baseline through 2019 ithin WRIA 4.	ommentsAdaptiveenchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the atutory baseline was shown to be achieved through erial photo interpretation and analysis. Skagit County otains high resolution aerial photography from agleView (formerly Pictometry) every two years since 007. A GIS layer of the VSP project area was created, and l areas within the VSP Project Area were investigated for ears 2011, 2017, and 2019. There was no net loss of parian buffer from the statutory baseline through 2019 ithin WRIA 4.Adaptive

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark of no net loss of riparian buffer below the statutory baseline is being monitored through high resolution aerial photo interpretation and analysis. First, waterbodies in the VSP Intersect Area were corrected and that data was updated with the Department of Ecology to be incorporated into the National Hydrography Dataset. Next, the regulated waterbodies were buffered with a GIS polygon based on standard buffer distances by water type. This area was monitored for change from the 2011 to 2017/2019 aerial photos. Skagit County receives these aerial photos every two years and will continue to use this data for change detection. This can also be supplemented with NOAA land coverages once the 1 meter land cover data becomes available.

#### Monitoring sufficient?

🗹 Yes 🛛 🗆 No

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife populations and their associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline		Frequently Floode	d
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of ri of July 22, 2011, within the standard distances prescribed	parian buffer existing as for each water type.	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmeGoal and Benchmark do not apply to thisCritical Area.	n <u>t</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish populations and their associated habitats. No degradation 2011 baseline.	and wildlife below the statutory	Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of ri of July 22, 2011, within the standard distances prescribed	parian buffer existing as for each water type.	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmeGoal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.Accomplishme	<u>nt</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish populations and their associated habitats. No degradation 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 2 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of ri	and wildlife below the statutory parian buffer existing as	Wetlands 4 - Upper Skagit	
of July 22, 2011, within the standard distances prescribed in the standard distances prescr	for each water type.		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and reduce the poter and property damage associated with flooding. No degrad statutory 2011 baseline.	ntial for physical injury ation below the	Critical Aquifer Re	charge
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, no new structur floodplain that are not compliant with the County's flood o development that impedes floodplain habitat function inco allowed by the flood code.	res within the code, and no onsistent with that	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmeGoal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.Accomplishme	<u>nt</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injury and property damage associated with flooding. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.			ry Fish and Wildlif	e Habitat
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, no new structures within the floodplain that are not compliant with the County's flood code, and no development that impedes floodplain habitat function inconsistent with that		1 - Nooksack		
allowed by the noo	a coue.			
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	<u>scription</u> k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hy and property dama statutory 2011 base	drologic functions and r ge associated with flood	educe the potential for physical injur ding. No degradation below the	ry Frequently Floo	ded
Benchmark: 3 - Wit	hin the intersect areas	no new structures within the	1 - Nooksack	
floodplain that are development that i allowed by the floo	not compliant with the mpedes floodplain habi d code.	County's flood code, and no tat function inconsistent with that		
Strategy/Metric De	scription	Accomplishment		Status
Within the VSP inte structures within th not compliant with code, an no new de impedes floodplain inconsistent with th code.	rsect areas, no new e floodplain that are the County's flood velopment that habitat function hat allowed by the flood	The County's continued participation Flood Insurance Program requires or the Department of Ecology through Rating System. Ecology oversees the Visits (CAV) program which requires non-compliance finding. Through an report findings, the County ensured unresolved issues in the VSP intersec ongoing agriculture.	n in the National ngoing monitoring by the Community Community Assisted the correction of any assessment of CAV that there were no ct area related to	Met / d y
Benchmark Met?	<u>Comments</u>		Adaptive Manageme	ent?
✓ Yes □ No	The benchmark was ac Community Assisted Vi zoning, their status as o documenting their reso unresolved CAV finding	hieved by obtaining and assessing sit findings and classifying their ongoing agriculture, and olution status. There were no as related to ongoing agriculture.	☐ Yes	
Benchmark Monito	ring	Monitori	ng sufficient?	
The benchmark was Community Assisted Development Servic lead by the Departn Emergency Manage by zoning, ongoing a	s monitored by obtaining d Visits from the Skagit C ces Department. Commu nent of Ecology on beha ment Agency. These find agriculture status, and re	g all findings from the County Planning and Inity Assisted Visits are If of the Federal dings were then classified esolution status.	No	

Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and and property damage associated with floo statutory 2011 baseline.	Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain hab allowed by the flood code.	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and and property damage associated with floo statutory 2011 baseline.	reduce the potential for physical injury ding. No degradation below the	Wetlands
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain hab allowed by the flood code.	no new structures within the County's flood code, and no itat function inconsistent with that	1 - Nooksack
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and and property damage associated with floo statutory 2011 baseline.	reduce the potential for physical injury ding. No degradation below the	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain hab allowed by the flood code.	no new structures within the County's flood code, and no itat function inconsistent with that	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injury and property damage associated with flooding. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.			jury Fish and Wildl	ife Habitat
Benchmark: 3 - Wit	hin the intersect areas,	no new structures within the	3 - Lower Skag	git - Samish
floodplain that are development that i allowed by the floo	not compliant with the mpedes floodplain habind code.	County's flood code, and no tat function inconsistent with that		
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	escription k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hy and property dama statutory 2011 base	drologic functions and r ge associated with flood eline.	educe the potential for physical in ling. No degradation below the	jury Frequently Flo	ooded
Benchmark: 3 - Wit floodplain that are development that i allowed by the floo	hin the intersect areas, not compliant with the mpedes floodplain habi od code.	no new structures within the County's flood code, and no tat function inconsistent with that	3 - Lower Skag	git - Samish
Strategy/Metric De	scription	Accomplishment_		<u>Status</u>
Within the VSP inte structures within th not compliant with code, an no new de impedes floodplain inconsistent with th code.	rsect areas, no new e floodplain that are the County's flood velopment that habitat function hat allowed by the flood	The County's continued participat Flood Insurance Program requires the Department of Ecology throug Rating System. Ecology oversees t Visits (CAV) program which requir non-compliance finding. Through report findings, the County ensure unresolved issues in the VSP inters ongoing agriculture.	ion in the National ongoing monitoring l gh the Community he Community Assist es the correction of a an assessment of CAV ed that there were no sect area related to	Met by ed ny /
Benchmark Met?	<u>Comments</u>		Adaptive Managen	nent?
✓ Yes □ No	The benchmark was achieved by obtaining and assessing Community Assisted Visit findings and classifying their zoning, their status as ongoing agriculture, and documenting their resolution status. There were no unresolved CAV findings related to ongoing agriculture.		☐ Yes ☑ No	
Benchmark Monito	ring	Monite	oring sufficient?	
The benchmark was Community Assisted Development Servic lead by the Departm Emergency Manage by zoning, ongoing a	s monitored by obtaining d Visits from the Skagit C ces Department. Commu nent of Ecology on beha ment Agency. These find agriculture status, and re	all findings from the Yes County Planning and Inity Assisted Visits are of the Federal dings were then classified esolution status.	□ No	

Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and r and property damage associated with floor statutory 2011 baseline.	Geologic Hazard	
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain habi allowed by the flood code.	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and r and property damage associated with floor statutory 2011 baseline.	reduce the potential for physical injury ding. No degradation below the	Wetlands
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain habi allowed by the flood code.	no new structures within the County's flood code, and no tat function inconsistent with that	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and r and property damage associated with floor statutory 2011 baseline.	educe the potential for physical injury ding. No degradation below the	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain habi allowed by the flood code.	no new structures within the County's flood code, and no tat function inconsistent with that	4 - Upper Skagit
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injury and property damage associated with flooding. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, no new structures within the floodplain that are not compliant with the County's flood code, and no development that impedes floodplain habitat function inconsistent with that allowed by the flood code.			ry Fish and Wildlife 4 - Upper Skagit	e Habitat
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	<u>scription</u> k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hy and property dama statutory 2011 base	drologic functions and r ge associated with flood eline.	educe the potential for physical inju ding. No degradation below the	ry Frequently Floor	ded
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, no new structures within the floodplain that are not compliant with the County's flood code, and no development that impedes floodplain habitat function inconsistent with that allowed by the flood code.			4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentWithin the VSP intersect areas, no new structures within the floodplain that are not compliant with the County's flood code, an no new development that impedes floodplain habitat function inconsistent with that allowed by the flood code.The County's continued part Flood Insurance Program red the Department of Ecology over Visits (CAV) program which o non-compliance finding. Thr report findings, the County o unresolved issues in the VSP ongoing agriculture.		Accomplishment The County's continued participation Flood Insurance Program requires of the Department of Ecology through Rating System. Ecology oversees the Visits (CAV) program which requires non-compliance finding. Through an report findings, the County ensured unresolved issues in the VSP interse ongoing agriculture.	on in the National ongoing monitoring by the Community e Community Assisted s the correction of any n assessment of CAV I that there were no ect area related to	<u>Status</u> Met
Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> The benchmark was ac Community Assisted Vi zoning, their status as o documenting their reso unresolved CAV finding	hieved by obtaining and assessing sit findings and classifying their ongoing agriculture, and plution status. There were no ss related to ongoing agriculture.	Adaptive Manageme	<u>nt?</u>
Benchmark Monito The benchmark was Community Assisted Development Servic lead by the Departm Emergency Manage by zoning, ongoing a	ring s monitored by obtaining d Visits from the Skagit C ces Department. Commu nent of Ecology on beha ment Agency. These find agriculture status, and re	g all findings from the Sounty Planning and unity Assisted Visits are If of the Federal dings were then classified esolution status.	<u>′ing sufficient?</u> □ No	

Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and r and property damage associated with floor statutory 2011 baseline.	Geologic Hazard		
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain habi allowed by the flood code.	no new structures within the County's flood code, and no tat function inconsistent with that	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and r and property damage associated with floor statutory 2011 baseline.	reduce the potential for physical injury ding. No degradation below the	Wetlands	
Benchmark: 3 - Within the intersect areas, floodplain that are not compliant with the development that impedes floodplain habi allowed by the flood code.	no new structures within the County's flood code, and no tat function inconsistent with that	4 - Upper Skagit	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, inf disrupting geologically hazardous areas or subject to naturally hazardous geologic pro statutory 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect areas, comply with regulations for seismic hazard	rastructure, and resources caused by by locating development in areas ocesses. No degradation below the all new agricultural structures must l areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	Critical Aquifer Re	echarge
susceptibility. <u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infr disrupting geologically hazardous areas or l subject to naturally hazardous geologic pro statutory 2011 baseline.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat	
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect areas, a comply with regulations for seismic hazard susceptibility.	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A
Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infr disrupting geologically hazardous areas or l subject to naturally hazardous geologic pro statutory 2011 baseline.	rastructure, and resources caused by by locating development in areas cesses. No degradation below the	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect areas, a comply with regulations for seismic hazard susceptibility.	all new agricultural structures must areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	1 - Nooksack
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 4 - Minimize disrupting geologic subject to naturall statutory 2011 bas Benchmark: 4 - Wi comply with regula susceptibility.	risk to life, property, inf cally hazardous areas or y hazardous geologic pro seline. thin the intersect areas, ations for seismic hazaro	rastructure, and resources caused by by locating development in areas ocesses. No degradation below the all new agricultural structures must areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	Geologic Hazard 1 - Nooksack
Strategy/Metric De Minimize risk to life infrastructure, and disrupting geologic by locating develop to naturally hazard No degradation be baseline.	escription e, property, resources caused by cally hazardous areas or oment in areas subject ous geologic processes. low the statutory 2011	Accomplishment Data was collected from the Skagit C Development Services permit databa structures permitted in Ag-NRL and the VSP intersect areas. Each permit see if contained seismic hazard cond conditions were met.	County Planning and Met ase for all agricultural RRc-NRL zones, i.e. file was reviewed to litions and if those
Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> The benchmark of ens comply with regulation achieved by examining compliance for all agric intersect areas. All Bui Building Permits issued complied with geohaza	uring all new agricultural structures as for seismic standards was geohazard requirements and cultural structures in the VSP Iding Permits and Commercial d in the VSP intersect areas ard conditions.	Adaptive Management? □ Yes ☑ No
Benchmark Monito	oring	Monitori	ng sufficient?
The benchmark wa Skagit County Plan searched for all bui the statutory basel analyzed to ensure research was coord	is monitored through per ning and Development S ilding permits within the ine through 2019. Each b compliance with geohaz dinated with Skagit Coun	rmit data obtained from ervices. The database was VSP intersect areas from puilding permit was eard conditions. This ty's Building Official.	No
Goal: 4 - Minimize disrupting geologic subject to naturall statutory 2011 bas Benchmark: 4 - Wi comply with regula susceptibility.	risk to life, property, inf cally hazardous areas or y hazardous geologic pro- seline. thin the intersect areas, ations for seismic hazaro	rastructure, and resources caused by by locating development in areas ocesses. No degradation below the all new agricultural structures must areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	Wetlands 1 - Nooksack
Strategy/Metric De Goal and Benchma Critical Area.	<u>escription</u> rk do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, in disrupting geologically hazardous areas of subject to naturally hazardous geologic p statutory 2011 baseline.	nfrastructure, and resources caused by or by locating development in areas processes. No degradation below the	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect area comply with regulations for seismic haza susceptibility.	s, all new agricultural structures must rd areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life property i	nfrastructure and resources caused by	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
disrupting geologically hazardous areas of subject to naturally hazardous geologic p statutory 2011 baseline.	or by locating development in areas processes. No degradation below the	
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect area comply with regulations for seismic haza susceptibility.	s, all new agricultural structures must rd areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Strategy/Metric Description	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A
Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, i	nfrastructure, and resources caused by	Frequently Flooded
disrupting geologically hazardous areas of subject to naturally hazardous geologic p statutory 2011 baseline.	or by locating development in areas processes. No degradation below the	
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect area comply with regulations for seismic haza susceptibility.	s, all new agricultural structures must rd areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Strategy/Metric Description	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

disrupting geologic subject to naturally statutory 2011 bas Benchmark: 4 - Wit comply with regula susceptibility.	ally hazardous areas or / hazardous geologic pro eline. :hin the intersect areas, itions for seismic hazaro	by locating development in a ocesses. No degradation belo all new agricultural structure l areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	rreas w the es must	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
Strategy/Metric De Minimize risk to life infrastructure, and disrupting geologics by locating develop to naturally hazarde No degradation bel baseline.	escription e, property, resources caused by ally hazardous areas or ment in areas subject ous geologic processes. ow the statutory 2011	Accomplishment Data was collected from the Development Services perm structures permitted in Ag-N the VSP intersect areas. Each see if contained seismic haze conditions were met.	Skagit Cou it database IRL and RR n permit fil ard conditio	nty Planning and Met for all agricultural c-NRL zones, i.e. e was reviewed to ons and if those	
Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<b>Comments</b> The benchmark of ensu- comply with regulation achieved by examining compliance for all agric intersect areas. All Buil Building Permits issued complied with geohaza	uring all new agricultural struct as for seismic standards was geohazard requirements and cultural structures in the VSP Iding Permits and Commercial d in the VSP intersect areas ard conditions.	Ad tures □	aptive Management? Yes	
Benchmark Monito The benchmark wa Skagit County Planr searched for all bui the statutory baseli analyzed to ensure research was coord	oring s monitored through per hing and Development So Iding permits within the ne through 2019. Each to compliance with geohaz inated with Skagit Coun	rmit data obtained from ervices. The database was VSP intersect areas from puilding permit was eard conditions. This ty's Building Official.	Monitoring ℤ <sub>Yes</sub> □	<u>sufficient?</u> ] No	
Goal: 4 - Minimize disrupting geologic subject to naturally statutory 2011 bas Benchmark: 4 - Wit comply with regula susceptibility.	risk to life, property, inf ally hazardous areas or / hazardous geologic pro eline. hin the intersect areas, tions for seismic hazarc	rastructure, and resources ca by locating development in a ocesses. No degradation belo all new agricultural structure l areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	used by reas w the es must	Wetlands 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
<u>Strategy/Metric De</u> Goal and Benchman Critical Area.	escription rk do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A	

Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by

**Geologic Hazard** 

Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by disrupting geologically hazardous areas or by locating development in areas subject to naturally hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.		Critical Aquifer Recharge	
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect areas, a comply with regulations for seismic hazard a susceptibility.	II new agricultural structures must areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: A. Minimiza risk to life property infr	astructure, and resources caused by	Fich and Wildlife Habitat	
disrupting geologically hazardous areas or b subject to naturally hazardous geologic proc statutory 2011 baseline.	y locating development in areas esses. No degradation below the		
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect areas, a comply with regulations for seismic hazard a susceptibility.	II new agricultural structures must areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	4 - Upper Skagit	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infra disrupting geologically hazardous areas or b subject to naturally hazardous geologic proc statutory 2011 baseline.	astructure, and resources caused by y locating development in areas cesses. No degradation below the	Frequently Flooded	
Benchmark: 4 - Within the intersect areas, a comply with regulations for seismic hazard a susceptibility.	Il new agricultural structures must areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	

disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	ally hazardous areas or hazardous geologic pro eline.	by locating development in a ocesses. No degradation belo	areas w the		
Benchmark: 4 - Wit comply with regular susceptibility.	hin the intersect areas, tions for seismic hazard	all new agricultural structure areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	es must	4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Der Minimize risk to life, infrastructure, and r disrupting geologica by locating develop to naturally hazardo No degradation belo baseline.	scription , property, resources caused by lly hazardous areas or ment in areas subject us geologic processes. ow the statutory 2011	Accomplishment Data was collected from the Development Services perm structures permitted in Ag-N the VSP intersect areas. Eac see if contained seismic haz conditions were met.	e Skagit Cour hit database NRL and RRc h permit file ard conditio	nty Planning and for all agricultural -NRL zones, i.e. was reviewed to ns and if those	<u>Status</u> Met
Benchmark Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<u>Comments</u> The benchmark of ensu comply with regulation achieved by examining compliance for all agric intersect areas. All Buil Building Permits issued complied with geohaza	uring all new agricultural structuring all new agricultural structures for seismic standards was geohazard requirements and cultural structures in the VSP ding Permits and Commercial in the VSP intersect areas ard conditions.	Ada ctures	n <mark>ptive Managemen</mark> Yes ⊻ No	<u>t?</u>
Benchmark Monito	ring		Monitoring	sufficient?	
The benchmark was Skagit County Plann searched for all buil the statutory baselin analyzed to ensure of research was coordi	monitored through per ing and Development Se ding permits within the ne through 2019. Each b compliance with geohaz nated with Skagit Count	mit data obtained from ervices. The database was VSP intersect areas from puilding permit was ard conditions. This ty's Building Official.	✔ Yes □	No	
Goal: 4 - Minimize r disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base Benchmark: 4 - With comply with regular susceptibility.	isk to life, property, inf ally hazardous areas or hazardous geologic pro eline. hin the intersect areas, tions for seismic hazard	rastructure, and resources ca by locating development in a ocesses. No degradation belo all new agricultural structure l areas, e.g., soil liquefaction	aused by areas w the es must	Wetlands 4 - Upper Skagit	
Strategy/Metric Der Goal and Benchmar Critical Area.	scription k do not apply to this	<u>Accomplishment</u>			<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by Geologic Hazard

Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.		Critical Aquifer Recharge	
Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	no net loss of wetlands or buffers	1 - Nooksack	
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Fish and Wildlife	Habitat
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Frequently Floode	ed
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Geologic Hazard 1 - Nooksack	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A

## Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of wetlands or buffers

existing as of July 22, 2011.

#### Strategy/Metric Description

Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.

#### Accomplishment

Skagit County obtained the 2011 and 2016 Washington State Department of Ecology Wetlands Inventory, which is based on the NOAA Coast Change Analysis Program (C-CAP) protocol for determining land cover. The data set was narrowed down to our VSP intersect areas (all Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones). All sites with land cover classification changes indicating a wetland loss or downgrade between 2011 and 2016 were evaluated. In total, there were 54 sites examined. These were investigated further using EagleView aerial imagery, which is available for Skagit County for years 2011 and 2017.

#### Benchmark Met? Comments

✓ Yes 🗆 No The benchmark to achieve no net loss of wetlands or buffers was shown to be achieved through analyzing the Washington State Department of Ecology's wetland change inventory. All sites with land cover classification changes indicating a wetland loss or downgrade between 2011 and 2016 were evaluated. In total, there were 54 sites examined. These were investigated further using high resolution EagleView aerial imagery, which is available for Skagit County for years 2011 and 2017. In conclusion, 76% of sites had observed visible change. Of these, 78% of this change was due to natural causes such as river migration, shoreline migration, or natural plant growth or loss. 22% of sites that had observed visible change were due to human activity, however none of these sites showed wetland loss or a downgrade in land use classification. Changes detected were either slight variations in continued agriculture or visible gains in surface water and wetland habitat, such as quarries, retention ponds, or created wetlands.

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark was monitored by obtaining the 2011 and 2016 Washington State Department of Ecology Wetlands Inventory data, narrowing down the change detection to VSP Intersect areas, and examining the sites identified as a wetland loss or downgrade. In future reporting, higher resolution imagery may be available and provide for more accurate analysis of land cover classification change.

#### Adaptive Management?

🗆 Yes 🛛 🗹 No

#### Monitoring sufficient?

🗹 Yes 🗌 No

#### Wetlands

1 - Nooksack

<u>Status</u> Met

Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, a existing as of July 22, 2011.	no net loss of wetlands or buffers	3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, r existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Geologic Hazard 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A

#### Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of wetlands or buffers

existing as of July 22, 2011.

#### Strategy/Metric Description

Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.

#### Accomplishment

Skagit County obtained the 2011 and 2016 Washington State Department of Ecology Wetlands Inventory, which is based on the NOAA Coast Change Analysis Program (C-CAP) protocol for determining land cover. The data set was narrowed down to our VSP intersect areas (all Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones). All sites with land cover classification changes indicating a wetland loss or downgrade between 2011 and 2016 were evaluated. In total, there were 54 sites examined. These were investigated further using EagleView aerial imagery, which is available for Skagit County for years 2011 and 2017.

#### Benchmark Met? Comments

✓ Yes

🗆 No The benchmark to achieve no net loss of wetlands or buffers was shown to be achieved through analyzing the Washington State Department of Ecology's wetland change inventory. All sites with land cover classification changes indicating a wetland loss or downgrade between 2011 and 2016 were evaluated. In total, there were 54 sites examined. These were investigated further using high resolution EagleView aerial imagery, which is available for Skagit County for years 2011 and 2017. In conclusion, 76% of sites had observed visible change. Of these, 78% of this change was due to natural causes such as river migration, shoreline migration, or natural plant growth or loss. 22% of sites that had observed visible change were due to human activity, however none of these sites showed wetland loss or a downgrade in land use classification. Changes detected were either slight variations in continued agriculture or visible gains in surface water and wetland habitat, such as quarries, retention ponds, or created wetlands.

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark was monitored by obtaining the 2011 and 2016 Washington State Department of Ecology Wetlands Inventory data, narrowing down the change detection to VSP Intersect areas, and examining the sites identified as a wetland loss or downgrade. In future reporting, higher resolution imagery may be available and provide for more accurate analysis of land cover classification change.

#### **Adaptive Management?**

□ Yes ✓ No

#### **Monitoring sufficient?**

✓ Yes 

#### Wetlands

3 - Lower Skagit - Samish

**Status** 

Met

Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline.	Critical Aquifer Re	echarge
Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	no net loss of wetlands or buffers	4 - Upper Skagit	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Fish and Wildlife 4 - Upper Skagit	Habitat
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Frequently Floode 4 - Upper Skagit	ed
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to degradation. No degradation below the sta Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, existing as of July 22, 2011.	prevent their continual loss and tutory 2011 baseline. no net loss of wetlands or buffers	Geologic Hazard 4 - Upper Skagit	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>		<u>Status</u> N/A

# Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Benchmark: 5 - Within the intersect areas, no net loss of wetlands or buffers

existing as of July 22, 2011.

#### Strategy/Metric Description

Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.

#### Accomplishment

Skagit County obtained the 2011 and 2016 Washington State Department of Ecology Wetlands Inventory, which is based on the NOAA Coast Change Analysis Program (C-CAP) protocol for determining land cover. The data set was narrowed down to our VSP intersect areas (all Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones). All sites with land cover classification changes indicating a wetland loss or downgrade between 2011 and 2016 were evaluated. In total, there were 54 sites examined. These were investigated further using EagleView aerial imagery, which is available for Skagit County for years 2011 and 2017.

#### Benchmark Met? Comments

✓ Yes 🗆 No The benchmark to achieve no net loss of wetlands or buffers was shown to be achieved through analyzing the Washington State Department of Ecology's wetland change inventory. All sites with land cover classification changes indicating a wetland loss or downgrade between 2011 and 2016 were evaluated. In total, there were 54 sites examined. These were investigated further using high resolution EagleView aerial imagery, which is available for Skagit County for years 2011 and 2017. In conclusion, 76% of sites had observed visible change. Of these, 78% of this change was due to natural causes such as river migration, shoreline migration, or natural plant growth or loss. 22% of sites that had observed visible change were due to human activity, however none of these sites showed wetland loss or a downgrade in land use classification. Changes detected were either slight variations in continued agriculture or visible gains in surface water and wetland habitat, such as quarries, retention ponds, or created wetlands.

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

The benchmark was monitored by obtaining the 2011 and 2016 Washington State Department of Ecology Wetlands Inventory data, narrowing down the change detection to VSP Intersect areas, and examining the sites identified as a wetland loss or downgrade. In future reporting, higher resolution imagery may be available and provide for more accurate analysis of land cover classification change.

#### Adaptive Management?

🗆 Yes 🛛 🗹 No

#### Monitoring sufficient?

VSP 5 Year Report for Skagit County - Page 32 of 64

🗹 Yes 🛛 🗆 No

# 4 - Upper Skagit

Wetlands

<u>Status</u>

Met

Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inte	ersect areas.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas	, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2	1 - Nooksack
acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher 0	Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5	
acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Sl	kagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	
Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this		N/A
Critical Area.		

Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.

Strategy/Metric Description

Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Status

1 - Nooksack

FWHCA enhancements through voluntary, incentive based measures.	Skagit County solicited consultants with a Request for Proposals to support the compilation of restoration data related to this goal. After rankings, the County selected The Watershed Company to assist in components of implementing the VSP Work Plan, including outreach and education and compiling all FWHCA restoration within the VSP Project area. The Watershed Company tallied restoration projects from a variety of sources, including the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program, the Skagit Conservation District's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, the Skagit Watershed Council's riparian database, and the Recreation and Conservation Office PRISM database. These projects were overlaid with the VSP project area created as part of the FWHCA protection goal.	Exceeded
Benchmark Met? Comments ✓ Yes □ No The benchmark to ach voluntary, incentive-ba ongoing implementati County's Natural Reso Conservation District's Enhancement Program following goals, which Lower Skagit/2 acres, Nookachamps/2 acres Skagit/2 acres, and Sag	Adaptive Management ieve enhancements through □ Yes ✓ No ased measures was achieved by the on of existing programs, namely the urces Stewardship Program and the is Conservation Reserve and n. For 2020, these subbasins had the were all met: Samish/5 acres, Fisher Carpenter/0.5 acres, 5, Middle Skagit/5 acres, Upper uk/1 acre. These were rolled up into	?

Accomplishment

WRIAs for this report.

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

This benchmark was monitored by compiling restoration data since the statutory baseline year of 2011 through July 2020. Critical Area enhancement located within the VSP Project Area were identified and tallied for each subbasin identified in the County's Work Plan, and rolled up by WRIA.

#### **Monitoring sufficient?**

🗹 Yes 🛛 🗆 No

printed 01/19/2021 12:07:3

Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Ska	sect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 arpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 agit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Frequently Flooded 1 - Nooksack
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Ska	sect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 arpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 agit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Geologic Hazard 1 - Nooksack
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Ska	sect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 arpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 agit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Wetlands 1 - Nooksack
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A
Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Ska	sect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 arpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 agit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Critical Aquifer Recharge 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A

Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.

Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish

Status

Strategy/Metric Description
-----------------------------

incentive based measures.

FWHCA enhancements through voluntary,

#### **Accomplishment**

Skagit County solicited consultants with a Request for Exceeded Proposals to support the compilation of restoration data related to this goal. After rankings, the County selected The Watershed Company to assist in components of implementing the VSP Work Plan, including outreach and education and compiling all FWHCA restoration within the VSP Project area. The Watershed Company tallied restoration projects from a variety of sources, including the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program, the Skagit Conservation District's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, the Skagit Watershed Council's riparian database, and the Recreation and Conservation Office PRISM database. These projects were overlaid with the VSP project area created as part of the FWHCA protection goal.

Benchmark Met?		<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive	Management?
Yes	□ No	The benchmark to achieve enhancements through voluntary, incentive-based measures was achieved by the ongoing implementation of existing programs, namely the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program and the Conservation District's Conservation Reserve and Enhancement Program. For 2020, these subbasins had the following goals, which were all met: Samish/5 acres, Lower Skagit/2 acres, Fisher Carpenter/0.5 acres, Nookachamps/2 acres, Middle Skagit/5 acres, Upper Skagit/2 acres, and Sauk/1 acre. These were rolled up into WRIAs for this report.	□ Yes	✓ No

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

This benchmark was monitored by compiling restoration data since the statutory baseline year of 2011 through July 2020. Critical Area enhancement located within the VSP Project area were identified and tallied for each subbasin identified in the County's Work Plan, and rolled up by WRIA.

#### **Monitoring sufficient?**

🗹 Yes 🛛 🗆 No

Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Sk	Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish		
Strategy/Metric Description Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Ska	rsect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 arpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 agit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Geologic Hazard 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Ska	rsect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 arpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 agit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Wetlands 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	
Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP inter Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Ca acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Sk	rsect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 arpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 agit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Critical Aquifer Recharge 4 - Upper Skagit	
<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u> Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u> N/A	

Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.

Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish, 2 acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, 5 acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat** 4 - Upper Skagit

#### Strategy/Metric Description

incentive based measures.

FWHCA enhancements through voluntary,

#### Accomplishment

Status Skagit County solicited consultants with a Request for Exceeded Proposals to support the compilation of restoration data related to this goal. After rankings, the County selected The Watershed Company to assist in components of implementing the VSP Work Plan, including outreach and education and compiling all FWHCA restoration within the VSP Project area. The Watershed Company tallied restoration projects from a variety of sources, including the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program, the Skagit Conservation District's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, the Skagit Watershed Council's riparian database, and the Recreation and Conservation Office PRISM database. These projects were overlaid with the VSP project area created as part of the FWHCA protection goal.

Benchmark Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive	Management?
✓ Yes □ No	The benchmark to achieve enhancements through voluntary, incentive-based measures was achieved by the ongoing implementation of existing programs, namely the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program and the Conservation District's Conservation Reserve and Enhancement Program. For 2020, these subbasins had the following goals, which were all met: Samish/5 acres, Lower Skagit/2 acres, Fisher Carpenter/0.5 acres, Nookachamps/2 acres, Middle Skagit/5 acres, Upper Skagit/2 acres, and Sauk/1 acre. These were rolled up into WPLAs for this report	□ Yes	✓ No

#### **Benchmark Monitoring**

This benchmark was monitored by compiling restoration data since the statutory baseline year of 2011 through July 2020. Critical Area enhancement located within the VSP Project area were identified and tallied for each subbasin identified in the County's Work Plan, and rolled up by WRIA.

#### **Monitoring sufficient?**

✓ Yes

Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Frequently Flooded
acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	5
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	N/A
Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish	a, 2 4 - Upper Skagit
acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	5
Strategy/Metric Description Accomplishment	<u>Status</u>
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentGoal and Benchmark do not apply to this	<u>Status</u> N/A
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentGoal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.Critical Area	<u>Status</u> N/A
Strategy/Metric Description       Accomplishment         Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this       Critical Area.         Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.	<u>Status</u> N/A Wetlands
Strategy/Metric Description       Accomplishment         Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this       Critical Area.         Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.       Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas. by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish	Status         N/A         Wetlands         4 - Upper Skagit
Strategy/Metric Description       Accomplishment         Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this       Critical Area.         Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.       Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.	Status N/AN/A4 - Upper Skagit
Strategy/Metric Description       Accomplishment         Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this       Critical Area.         Goal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.       Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.         Strategy/Metric Description       Accomplishment	Status N/A Wetlands 4 - Upper Skagit 5 Status
Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentGoal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.Strategy/Metric DescriptionGoal: 6 - Enhance critical areas in VSP intersect areas.Benchmark: 6 - Within the intersect areas, by 2020 enhance 5 acres in Samish acres in Lower Skagit, 0.5 acres in Fisher Carpenter, 2 acres in Nookachamps, acres in Middle Skagit, 2 acres in Upper Skagit, and 1 acre in Sauk subbasins.Strategy/Metric DescriptionAccomplishmentGoal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.	Status N/A Wetlands 4 - Upper Skagit 5 Status N/A

## Goal Results

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfaceWetwater quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including1 - Npotable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.1

Wetlands 1 - Nooksack

Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adapti	ive Management?
□ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>		□ Yes	No
Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h	uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, groun uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit Cou uman use. No degradation below the statutory	nd and surface W unty, including 3 2011 baseline.	/etlands - Lower Skagit - Samish

Goal Met	2	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive	Management?
□ Yes	□ No		□ Yes	□ No

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface Wetlands water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including 4 - Upper Skagit potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Goal Met? **Adaptive Management?** Comments □ Yes Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface **Critical Aquifer Recharge** water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including 1 - Nooksack potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Goal Met? Comments Adaptive Management? ✓ Yes ✓ No The goal of achieving protection of aquifer recharge areas was met through investigating Group A water system test results which yielded no violations to investigate further. The VSP Intersect Areas are also protected by regulations including state and federal pesticide regulations and the County's agricultural watercourse protection measures found in SCC 14.24.120(4)(b) which requires agricultural operators to apply farm chemicals with all requirements stated on the chemical container labels and limit application of crop nutrients to agronomic rates intended for that particular crop. As noted in the Work Plan, if a contamination is found and believed to be due to agricultural activity, the County will work with the Washington State Department of Agriculture and agricultural operators in the drainage area on remediation. Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface **Critical Aquifer Recharge** water quality and quantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, including 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish potable water for human use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Goal Met? Comments Adaptive Management? □ Yes ✓ Yes ✓ No The goal of achieving protection of aquifer recharge areas was met through investigating Group A water system test results which yielded no violations to investigate further. The VSP Intersect Areas are also protected by regulations including state and federal pesticide regulations and the County's agricultural watercourse protection measures found in SCC 14.24.120(4)(b) which requires agricultural operators to apply farm chemicals with all requirements stated on the chemical container labels and limit application of crop nutrients to agronomic rates intended for that particular crop. As noted in the Work Plan, if a contamination is found and believed to be due to agricultural activity, the County will work with the Washington State Department of Agriculture and agricultural operators in the drainage area on remediation.

	additive for supprying an needs within skagit county, includ	ing 4 - Upper Skagit
potable water for h	uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseli	ne.
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Yes □ No	The goal of achieving protection of aquifer recharge areas was met through investigating Group A water system test results which yielded no violations to investigate further. The VSP Intersect Areas are also protected by regulations including state and federal pesticide regulations and the County's agricultural watercourse protection measures found in SCC 14.24.120(4)(b) which requires agricultural operators to apply farm chemicals with all requirements stated on the chemical container labels and limit application of crop nutrients to agronomic rates intended for that particular crop. As noted in the Work Plan, if a contamination is found and believed to be due to agricultural activity, the County will work with the Washington State Department of Agriculture and agricultural operators in the drainage area on remediation.	□ Yes INO
Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h	uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseli	ice Frequently Flooded ing 1 - Nooksack ne.
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal Met? Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h	<u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseli	Adaptive Management? Yes No Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish No
Goal Met? Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h Goal Met? Yes No	<u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseli <u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management? Yes No Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish Adaptive Management? Yes No
Goal Met? Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h <u>Goal Met?</u> Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h	<u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfate uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseling <u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfate uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseling	Adaptive Management? Yes No Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish No Adaptive Management? Yes No Frequently Flooded ing 4 - Upper Skagit
Goal Met? Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h Goal Met? Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h Goal Met? Qoal Met? No	<u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfate uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseling <u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfate uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseling <u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management? Yes No Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish Adaptive Management? Yes No Adaptive Management? Yes No Adaptive Management? Yes No
Goal Met? Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h <u>Goal Met?</u> Yes No Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h <u>Goal Met?</u> Yes No <u>Goal Met?</u> Goal: 1 - Protect aq water quality and q potable water for h	<u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfation uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline <u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfation uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline <u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfation uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline <u>Comments</u> uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfation unantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ unantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ unan use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline unantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includ uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline	Adaptive Management?         Yes       No         Ice       Frequently Flooded         ing       3 - Lower Skagit - Samish         ne.       Adaptive Management?         Yes       No         Adaptive Management?       No         Yes       No         Ice       Frequently Flooded         Yes       No         Ice       Frequently Flooded         Yes       No         Adaptive Management?       Yes         Yes       No         Adaptive Management?       No         Yes       No         Ice       Geologic Hazard         Ing       1 - Nooksack

Goal: 1 - Protect aquifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surface Critical Aquifer Recharge

Goal: 1 - Protect aqu water quality and q potable water for h	ifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includi uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baselir	ce Geologic Hazard ng 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish ne.
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 1 - Protect aqu water quality and q potable water for h	uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includi uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baselir	ce Geologic Hazard ng 4 - Upper Skagit ne.
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 1 - Protect aqu water quality and q potable water for h	uifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includi uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baselir	ce Fish and Wildlife Habitat ng 1 - Nooksack ne.
<u>Goal Met?</u> ☑ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management? □ Yes ☑ No
Goal: 1 - Protect aqu water quality and q potable water for h	lifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includi uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baselir	ce Fish and Wildlife Habitat ng 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish ne.
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 1 - Protect aqu water quality and q potable water for h	lifer recharge areas, and well-head areas, ground and surfa uantity for supplying all needs within Skagit County, includi uman use. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baselir	ce Fish and Wildlife Habitat ng 4 - Upper Skagit ne.
Goal Met?	<b>0</b>	
🗆 Yes 👘 No	Comments	Adaptive Management?
Yes No Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline.	<u>Comments</u> store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Adaptive Management? Yes No Wetlands 1 - Nooksack
Yes No Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline. <u>Goal Met?</u> Yes No	<u>Comments</u> store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory <u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?         Yes       No         Wetlands         1 - Nooksack         Adaptive Management?         Yes       No
<ul> <li>Yes No</li> <li>Goal: 2 - Protect, response of the 2011 baseline.</li> <li>Goal Met?</li> <li>Yes No</li> <li>Goal: 2 - Protect, response of the 2011 baseline.</li> </ul>	<u>Comments</u> store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory <u>Comments</u> store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Adaptive Management? Ves No Wetlands 1 - Nooksack Adaptive Management? Ves No Wetlands 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish

Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Wetlands 4 - Upper Skagit
2011 baseline.		
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Critical Aquifer Recharge 1 - Nooksack
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Critical Aquifer Recharge 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline.	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Critical Aquifer Recharge 4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline.	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife Fir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Frequently Flooded 1 - Nooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	Frequently Flooded 4 - Upper Skagit
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?

Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline.	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	6	ieolo - No	ogic Hazard ooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adapt	t <b>ive</b> s	Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline.	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	3	ieolo - Lo	ogic Hazard wer Skagit - Samish
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adapt	t <b>ive</b>	Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline.	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	G 4	ieolo - Up	ogic Hazard oper Skagit
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adapt	t <b>ive</b> s	Management?
Goal: 2 - Protect, res populations and the 2011 baseline.	store where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife ir associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory	F 1	ish a No	and Wildlife Habitat ooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> ✓ <sub>Yes</sub> □ No	<b>Comments</b> The goal to protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife populations and their associated habitats with no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline was met through an aerial photo monitoring and assessment methodology. Within WRIA 1, there was no net loss of riparian buffer between 2011 and 2019. The monitored riparian areas were classified based on vegetation height. Losses of greater than 0.25 acre became a dataset to investigate. Staff developed a flow chart to systematically address losses. A multidisciplinary team has reviewed all losses capture by the 2017 aerial photo change detection; the additional losses from 2019 will also be put through the flow chart, categorized, and investigated. The Watershed Group will adopt a strategy by September 2021 to work with landowners where losses have occurred. All unexcused vegetation losses were documented and are available for review in a GIS format. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including the County's CAO for Ongoing Agriculture and its watercourse protection measures.	<u>Adapt</u> □ <sub>Ye</sub>	tive   s	Management? ₪ No

Goal: 2 - Protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife populations and their associated habitats. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.

#### Goal Met?

✓ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>

#### <u>Comments</u>

The goal to protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife populations and their associated habitats with no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline was met through an aerial photo monitoring and assessment methodology. Within WRIA 3, there was no net loss of riparian buffer between 2011 and 2019. The monitored riparian areas were classified based on vegetation height. Losses of greater than 0.25 acre became a dataset to investigate. Staff developed a flow chart to systematically address losses. A multidisciplinary team has reviewed all losses capture by the 2017 aerial photo change detection; the additional losses from 2019 will also be put through the flow chart, categorized, and investigated. The Watershed Group will adopt a strategy by September 2021 to work with landowners where losses have occurred. All unexcused vegetation losses were documented and are available for review in a GIS format. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including the County's CAO for Ongoing Agriculture and its watercourse protection measures.

#### Adaptive Management?

□ <sub>Yes</sub> **✓** <sub>No</sub>

2011 baseline.		
2011 baseline. Goal Met? ▼ Yes □ No	<b>Comments</b> The goal to protect, restore where practical, and enhance fish and wildlife populations and their associated habitats with no degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline was met through an aerial photo monitoring and assessment methodology. Within WRIA 4, there was no net loss of riparian buffer between 2011 and 2019. The monitored riparian areas were classified based on vegetation height. Losses of greater than 0.25 acre became a dataset to investigate. Staff developed a flow chart to systematically address losses. A multidisciplinary team has reviewed all losses capture by the 2017 aerial photo change detection; the additional losses from 2019 will also be put through the flow chart, categorized, and investigated. The Watershed Group will adopt a strategy by September 2021 to work with landowners where losses have occurred. All unexcused vegetation losses were documented and are available for review in a GIS format. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by	Adaptive Management? □ Yes  No
Goal: 3 - Protect hyc and property damag statutory 2011 base <u>Goal Met?</u>	Agriculture and its watercourse protection measures. Irologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	Wetlands 1 - Nooksack Adaptive Management?
Yes No Goal: 3 - Protect hyc and property damag statutory 2011 base	Irologic functions and reduce the potential for physical inju ge associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	Yes No Wetlands 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property damag statutory 2011 base	Irologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	ury Wetlands 4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

4 - Upper Skagit

Goal: 3 - Protect hy and property dama	drologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the	ury Critical Aquifer Recharge 1 - Nooksack
statutory 2011 base Goal Met? Yes No	line. <u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hy and property dama statutory 2011 base	drologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the sline.	ury Critical Aquifer Recharge 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met? □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ No	Comments	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property damag	drologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the	ury Critical Aquifer Recharge 4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ No	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property dama statutory 2011 base	drologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	Iry Frequently Flooded 1 - Nooksack
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
¥ Yes □ No	The goal of no degradation below the statutory baseline and protecting hydrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injury and property damage associated with flooding was achieved through investigating Community Assisted Visit findings. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including the County's flood damage prevention regulations found in SCC Chapter 14.34. Agricultural activities are allowed in frequently flooded areas, but new land clearing or new structures must follow rules adopted to ensure the County's compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program, and by extension, the National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinion for NFIP compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The NFIP requires the County to have a regulatory component approach to comply with these mandates.	☐ Yes INO

Goal: 3 - Protect hydrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injury	Frequ
and property damage associated with flooding. No degradation below the	3 - Lov
statutory 2011 baseline.	

ently Flooded wer Skagit - Samish

Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?		
Yes □ No	The goal of no degradation below the statutory baseline and protecting hydrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injury and property damage associated with flooding was achieved through investigating Community Assisted Visit findings. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including the County's flood damage prevention regulations found in SCC Chapter 14.34. Agricultural activities are allowed in frequently flooded areas, but new land clearing or new structures must follow rules adopted to ensure the County's compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program, and by extension, the National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinion for NFIP compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The NFIP requires the County to have a regulatory component approach to comply with these mandates	□ <sub>Yes</sub> INO		
Goal: 3 - Protect hy and property dama statutory 2011 bas	rdrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the eline.	ury Frequently Flooded 4 - Upper Skagit		
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<b>Comments</b> The goal of no degradation below the statutory baseline and protecting hydrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injury and property damage associated with flooding was achieved through investigating Community Assisted Visit findings. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including the County's flood damage prevention regulations found in SCC Chapter 14.34. Agricultural activities are allowed in frequently flooded areas, but new land clearing or new structures must follow rules adopted to ensure the County's compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program, and by extension, the National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinion for NFIP compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The NFIP requires the County to have a regulatory component approach to comply with these mandates.	Adaptive Management? □ Yes  Mo		
Goal: 3 - Protect hy and property dama statutory 2011 bas	rdrologic functions and reduce the potential for physical injuge associated with flooding. No degradation below the eline.	ury Geologic Hazard 1 - Nooksack		
Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?		

Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property damag statutory 2011 base	rologic functions and reduce the potential for physical inju e associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	ry Geologic Hazard 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property damag statutory 2011 base	rologic functions and reduce the potential for physical inju e associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	ry Geologic Hazard 4 - Upper Skagit
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property damag statutory 2011 base	rologic functions and reduce the potential for physical inju e associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	ry Fish and Wildlife Habitat 1 - Nooksack
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property damag statutory 2011 base	rologic functions and reduce the potential for physical inju e associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	ry Fish and Wildlife Habitat 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 3 - Protect hyd and property damag statutory 2011 base	rologic functions and reduce the potential for physical inju e associated with flooding. No degradation below the line.	ry Fish and Wildlife Habitat 4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize ri disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	sk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by Ily hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the line.	y Wetlands 1 - Nooksack
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize ri disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	sk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by Ily hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the line.	y Wetlands 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?

Goal: 4 - Minimize ri disrupting geologica subject to naturally	isk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b Illy hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the	y Wetlands 4 - Upper Skagit
statutory 2011 base	line.	
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize ri disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	isk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b Illy hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the line.	y Critical Aquifer Recharge 1 - Nooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize ri disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	isk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b Illy hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the line.	y Critical Aquifer Recharge 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize ri disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	isk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b Illy hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the line.	y Critical Aquifer Recharge 4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize ri disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	isk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b Illy hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the line.	y Frequently Flooded 1 - Nooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize r disrupting geologica subject to naturally statutory 2011 base	isk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b Illy hazardous areas or by locating development in areas hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the line.	y Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	Comments	Adaptive Management?

**Frequently Flooded** Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by disrupting geologically hazardous areas or by locating development in areas 4 - Upper Skagit subject to naturally hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Goal Met? Comments Adaptive Management? □ Yes □ Yes Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by **Geologic Hazard** disrupting geologically hazardous areas or by locating development in areas 1 - Nooksack subject to naturally hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Goal Met? Adaptive Management? Comments 🗆 No V Yes ✓ No This goal was achieved through collecting and monitoring all permit data for agricultural structures in the VSP intersect area and ensuring all geohazard conditions were met. Because most of the Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones are in diked and drained areas, the major geological hazard within areas of agricultural activities are those within a high liquefaction susceptibility as indicated on the Liquefaction Susceptibility Map of Skagit County issued by the Washington Department of Natural Resources. The geotechnical reports associated with each building permit in the VSP intersect areas reviewed for permit compliance, including the liquefaction analysis. This generally includes testing to ensure adequate soil capacities for building foundation design. Goal: 4 - Minimize risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused by **Geologic Hazard** disrupting geologically hazardous areas or by locating development in areas 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish subject to naturally hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline. Goal Met? Adaptive Management? Comments ✓ Yes ✓ No This goal was achieved through collecting and monitoring all permit data for agricultural structures in the VSP intersect area and ensuring all geohazard conditions were met. Because most of the Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones are in diked and drained areas, the major geological hazard within areas of agricultural activities are those within a high liquefaction susceptibility as indicated on the Liquefaction Susceptibility Map of Skagit County issued by the Washington Department of Natural Resources. The geotechnical reports associated with each building permit in the VSP intersect areas reviewed for permit compliance, including the liquefaction analysis. This generally includes testing to ensure adequate soil capacities for building

foundation design.

Goal: 4 - Minimize disrupting geologi subject to natural statutory 2011 ba	e risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b cally hazardous areas or by locating development in areas ly hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the seline.	y Geologic Hazard 4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> ▼ <sub>Yes</sub> □ No	<b>Comments</b> This goal was achieved through collecting and monitoring all permit data for agricultural structures in the VSP intersect area and ensuring all geohazard conditions were met. Because most of the Ag-NRL and RRc-NRL zones are in diked and drained areas, the major geological hazard within areas of agricultural activities are those within a high liquefaction susceptibility as indicated on the Liquefaction Susceptibility Map of Skagit County issued by the Washington Department of Natural Resources. The geotechnical reports associated with each building permit in the VSP intersect areas reviewed for permit compliance, including the liquefaction analysis. This generally includes testing to ensure adequate soil capacities for building foundation design.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes
Goal: 4 - Minimize disrupting geologi subject to natural statutory 2011 ba	e risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b ically hazardous areas or by locating development in areas ly hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the seline.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 1 - Nooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize disrupting geologi subject to natural	e risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b cally hazardous areas or by locating development in areas ly hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the	y Fish and Wildlife Habitat 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 4 - Minimize disrupting geologi subject to natural statutory 2011 ba	e risk to life, property, infrastructure, and resources caused b ically hazardous areas or by locating development in areas ly hazardous geologic processes. No degradation below the seline.	y Fish and Wildlife Habitat 4 - Upper Skagit
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?

□ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>

Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.		Wetlands 1 - Nooksack
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
¥ Yes □ No	The goal to preserve and protection wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation with no degradation bellow the statutory baseline was achieved through the analysis of wetland change data. 91% of sites are located in WRIA 3, 9% of sites are located in WRIA 4 and no sites were returned for WRIA 1. After the analysis of the changes from the 2011 to 2016 dataset, none of 54 investigated sites showed wetland loss or a downgrade in land use classification. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including SCC 14.24.070(2) which requires any expansion of agriculture into critical area or its buffer to comply with the substantive and procedural provisions of the critical areas code.	☐ Yes  ☑ No
Goal: 5 - Preserve a degradation. No de	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Wetlands 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
<u>Goal Met?</u> ▼ <sub>Yes</sub> □ No	<b>Comments</b> The goal to preserve and protection wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation with no degradation bellow the statutory baseline was achieved through the analysis of wetland change data. 91% of sites are located in WRIA 3, 9% of sites are located in WRIA 4 and no sites were returned for WRIA 1. After the analysis of the changes from the 2011 to 2016 dataset, none of 54 investigated sites showed wetland loss or a downgrade in land use classification. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including SCC 14.24.070(2) which requires any expansion of agriculture into critical area or its buffer to comply with the substantive and procedural provisions of the critical areas code.	Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes  Mo

Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss andWetlandsdegradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.4 - Upper Skagit					
Goal Met? ✓ Yes □ No	<b>Comments</b> The goal to preserve and protection wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation with no degradation bellow the statutory baseline was achieved through the analysis of wetland change data. 91% of sites are located in WRIA 3, 9% of sites are located in WRIA 4 and no sites were returned for WRIA 1. After the analysis of the changes from the 2011 to 2016 dataset, none of 54 investigated sites showed wetland loss or a downgrade in land use classification. In addition, VSP intersect areas are protected by regulations including SCC 14.24.070(2) which requires any expansion of agriculture into critical area or its buffer to comply with the substantive and procedural provisions of the critical areas code.	Adaptive Management? □ Yes  No			
Goal: 5 - Preserve and degradation. No deg	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Critical Aquifer Recharge 1 - Nooksack			
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?			
Goal: 5 - Preserve a degradation. No dea	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Critical Aquifer Recharge 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish			
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?			
Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and degradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.Critical Aquifer Recharge 4 - Upper Skagit		Critical Aquifer Recharge 4 - Upper Skagit			
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?			
Goal: 5 - Preserve an degradation. No dea	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Frequently Flooded 1 - Nooksack			
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?			
Goal: 5 - Preserve an degradation. No dea	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Frequently Flooded 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish			
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?			

Goal: 5 - Preserve and protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss andFrequently Floodeddegradation. No degradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.4 - Upper Skagit			
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	
Goal: 5 - Preserve ar degradation. No deg	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Geologic Hazard 1 - Nooksack	
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	
Goal: 5 - Preserve ar degradation. No deg	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Geologic Hazard 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	
Goal: 5 - Preserve ar degradation. No deg	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Geologic Hazard 4 - Upper Skagit	
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	
Goal: 5 - Preserve ar degradation. No deg	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 1 - Nooksack	
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	
Goal: 5 - Preserve ar degradation. No deg	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish	
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	
Goal: 5 - Preserve ar degradation. No deg	nd protect wetlands to prevent their continual loss and gradation below the statutory 2011 baseline.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 4 - Upper Skagit	
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	
Goal: 6 - Enhance cri	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Wetlands 1 - Nooksack	
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?	

Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Wetlands
		3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Wetlands
		4 - Upper Skagit
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		1 - Nooksack
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
		3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
🗆 Yes 👘 No		└─ Yes └─ No
Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Critical Aquifer Recharge 4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Frequently Flooded
		1 - Nooksack
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Frequently Flooded
		3 - Lower Skagit - Samish
Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance cr	itical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Frequently Flooded
		4 - Upper Skagit
Goal Met? □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?

Goal: 6 - Ennance c	rifical areas in VSP intersect areas.	1 - Nooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance c	ritical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Geologic Hazard
		3 - Lower Skagit - Samis
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance c	ritical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Geologic Hazard
		4 - Upper Skagit
<u>Goal Met?</u> □ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?
Goal: 6 - Enhance c	ritical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Fish and Wildlife Habita
		1 - Nooksack
<u>Goal Met?</u> ✓ <sub>Yes</sub> □ No	<u>Comments</u> The goal to achieve EWHCA enhancements by subbasin	Adaptive Management?

I to achieve FWHCA enhancements by subbasin was shown to be achieved through the implementation of existing restoration programs. Restoration project information was gathered from a variety of project sources, including the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program, the Skagit Conservation District's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, the Skagit Watershed Council's riparian database, and the Recreation and Conservation Office PRISM database. These projects were overlaid with the VSP project area created as part of the FWHCA protection goal. Acres planted by subbasin include: Samish = 58.5 acres (goal of 5), Lower Skagit = 49.2 acres (goal of 2), Fisher Carpenter 19.5 acres (goal of 0.5), Nookachamps = 16 acres (goal of 2), Middle Skagit = 155.4 acres (goal of 5), Upper Skagit = 18 acres (goal of 2), and Sauk = 5 acres (goal of 1). By WRIA, these these plantings total 7.1 acres for WRIA 1, 272.8 acres for WRIA 3, and 41.7 acres for WRIA 4.

es 💌 No

Fish and Wildlife Habitat 3 - Lower Skagit - Samish

Goal Met?	<u>Comments</u>	Adaptive Management?		
Yes □ No	The goal to achieve FWHCA enhancements by subbasin was shown to be achieved through the implementation of existing restoration programs. Restoration project information was gathered from a variety of project sources, including the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program, the Skagit Conservation District's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, the Skagit Watershed Council's riparian database, and the Recreation and Conservation Office PRISM database. These projects were overlaid with the VSP project area created as part of the FWHCA protection goal. Acres planted by subbasin include: Samish = 58.5 acres (goal of 5), Lower Skagit = 49.2 acres (goal of 2), Fisher Carpenter 19.5 acres (goal of 0.5), Nookachamps = 16 acres (goal of 2), Middle Skagit = 155.4 acres (goal of 5), Upper Skagit = 18 acres (goal of 2), and Sauk = 5 acres (goal of 1). By WRIA, these these plantings total 7.1 acres for WRIA 1, 272.8 acres for WRIA 3, and 41.7 acres for WRIA 4.	□ <sub>Yes</sub>	✓ No	
Goal: 6 - Enhance ci	ritical areas in VSP intersect areas.	Fish a 4 - U	and Wildlife Habitat pper Skagit	

#### Goal Met?

✓ Yes □ No

#### <u>Comments</u>

The goal to achieve FWHCA enhancements by subbasin was shown to be achieved through the implementation of existing restoration programs. Restoration project information was gathered from a variety of project sources, including the County's Natural Resources Stewardship Program, the Skagit Conservation District's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, the Skagit Watershed Council's riparian database, and the Recreation and Conservation Office PRISM database. These projects were overlaid with the VSP project area created as part of the FWHCA protection goal. Acres planted by subbasin include: Samish = 58.5 acres (goal of 5), Lower Skagit = 49.2 acres (goal of 2), Fisher Carpenter 19.5 acres (goal of 0.5), Nookachamps = 16 acres (goal of 2), Middle Skagit = 155.4 acres (goal of 5), Upper Skagit = 18 acres (goal of 2), and Sauk = 5 acres (goal of 1). By WRIA, these these plantings total 7.1 acres for WRIA 1, 272.8 acres for WRIA 3, and 41.7 acres for WRIA 4.

#### Adaptive Management?

□ Yes No

#### **Participation Strategies and Performance Metrics**

Enter your best estimate of the number of Producers in the County watersheds:

1041

Goal: 7 - From baseline year through July 2020, 15 enrollments in the local voluntary enhancement programs, e.g. Natural Resources Stewardship Program

Benchmark: 7 - Number of landowners enrolled in the local voluntary enhancement programs, e.g. Natural Resources Stewardship Program

#### Strategy/Metric Description

<u>Accomplishment</u>

From the baseline year of 2011 through July 2020, number of enrollments in the Natural Resources Stewardship Program, a local voluntary enhancment program. From 2011 to 2020, the County's Natural Resources Stewardship program completed over 48 projects. These projects include native plantings, fencing, and/or the installation of large woody debris. Data was obtainted from the County's NRSP Coordinator.

Goal: 8 - From baseline year through July 2020, 6 enrollments in the current use open space tax program Benchmark: 8 - Number of landowners enrolled in the current use tax program

#### Strategy/Metric Description

From the baseline year of 2011 through July 2020, number of enrollments into Current Use Open Space Tax Programs

#### **Accomplishment**

From 2011 to 2020, the Skagit County Hearing Examiner Exceeded approved 106 enrollments or transfers into the Current Use Open Space tax programs. Data was obtained from the Skagit County Hearing Examiner, which posts all decisions to their website.

Goal: 9 - From baseline year through July 2020, 9 enrollments in the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, Wetland Reserve Program, or other relevant federal programs

Benchmark: 9 - Number of landowners enrolled in federal enhancement programs, e.g. Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, Wetland Reserve Program

#### Strategy/Metric Description

From the baseline year of 2011 to July 2020, number of enrollments into the Conservation Reserce Enhancement Program, Wetland Reserve Program, or other relevant federal programs.

#### **Accomplishment**

Skagit Conservation District implemented over 29 Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program contracts in the reporting period. Data was obtained from the Skagit Conservation District annual reports. In addition, Skagit County contracted with the Conservation District to implement six specific projects under the VSP, including a Cover Crop Program, AgWeather Stations, Plantings, Manure Pump, Cattle Alleyway, and Watering Station projects.

Goal: 10 - From baseline year through July 2020, execute 6 protective easements Benchmark: 10 - Number of landowners executing protective easements

#### Strategy/Metric Description

From the baseline year of 2011 through July 2020, number of enrollments in the local Farmland Legacy Program. <u>Accomplishment</u>

Between 2011 and 2020, Skagit County worked with 61 E farm families or businesses to execute Farmland Legacy Program Grant Deed of Conservation Easements. These easements collectively protect 4,465 acres of agricultural land and eliminate 78 development rights.

## <u>Status</u>

Status

Status

Exceeded

Exceeded

Exceeded

## **Critical Area Monitoring**

Monitoring Activity: Community Assisted Visit data from the Washington State Department of Ecology and Skagit County Planning and Development Services

#### Included Critical Area(s):

**Frequently Flooded** 

Type of data	Ecology				
Timeframe/sea collection (e.g.	ason for field sampling or data summer only, annually, mon	a Commu Ithly)	nity Assisted Visit (CAV)	data from 2011 th	rough 2019
Desired accura	icy of the Analysis		Obser	rved mean	
Number of san	nples drawn from existing dat	a 6	7 Observed standard	l deviation	
What statistica ANOVA, time s	al test was performed? (Ex. t-t series, regression, etc.)	est,			
Is the observat	tion statistically significant?	🗆 Yes 🛛 🗹 N	0		
Did the underly	ying data meet statistical test	assumptions (e.	., normality)? 🛛 🗆 Ye	s 🗹 No	
Briefly describe and why VSP ir implementatio	e the outcome of the monitor mplementation/lack of on contributed to the observat	ing There an Out of t tions 14 were were re	e no unresolved CAV fin ne 67 CAV findings from identified in areas of or solved and closed.	ndings in the VSP In the baseline year ngoing agriculture.	itersect Areas. through 2019, These 14 cases
Adaptive Mana	agement needed? 🛛 Yes	✓ No			

Monitoring Activity: Consumer Confidence Reports from the Washington State Department of Health on Group A Water Systems in Skagit County

#### Included Critical Area(s):

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Type of data DOH				
Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)	Consumer Confidence Reports from 2011 and 2018 from Group A Water Systems in Skagit County			
Desired accuracy of the Analysis	Observed mean			
Number of samples drawn from existing data	44 Observed standard deviation			
What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)				
Is the observation statistically significant? $\Box$ Ye	s 🗆 No			
Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumption	ptions (e.g., normality)? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No			
Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations	Consumer Confidence Reports on all Group A Water Systems were obtained via a Public Disclosure Request from the Department of Health. There were no agricultural marker violations recorded at any site in any year. 42 records were returned for 2011 and 44 were returned for 2018.			
Adaptive Management needed? 🗌 Yes 🛛 🗹 No				

#### Monitoring Activity: Building permit data from Skagit County Planning and Development Services

### Included Critical Area(s):

Geologic Hazard

Type of data	Other, explain:	Building Permit Data						
Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)			Every Building Permit in VSP Intersect Areas, commercial and non- commercial, from 2011 through 2019.					
Desired accurac	cy of the Analysis				Observed	l mean		
Number of samples drawn from existing data			119	Observed st	andard de	viation		
What statistical ANOVA, time se Is the observation	test was performed? eries, regression, etc.) on statistically significa	(Ex. t-test, ant? □ Yes	□ No					
Did the underly	ing data meet statistic	al test assumpt	tions (e.g., n	ormality)?	□ Yes	🗆 No		
Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations			All permits in the VSP intersect areas were obtained and analyzed from Skagit County's permit software. Those requiring a geohazard condition were investigated further to ensure those conditions were met, namely seismic standards. VSP implementation contributed to these observations.					
Adaptive Manag	gement needed? $\Box$	Yes 🗹 No						

#### Monitoring Activity: Washington State Department of Ecology Wetlands Inventory

#### Included Critical Area(s):

Wetlands

Input datasets used	Washington State Departmen Analysis Program protocol for	it of Ec	cology Wetlands I rmining land cove	nventory (l r) for years	based on NOAA C 2011 and 2016	oastal Change
Year of map/imagery f	or comparison with 2011 base	eline	2016			
Spatial accuracy of lea	st accurate input layer	30	Units for spatial	accuracy	Meters	
Classification accuracy	of least accurate input layer					
Field verification of ov	erall accuracy: Ommission					
Field verification of ov	erall accuracy: Commission					
Field verification of ov	erall accuracy: Kappa					
Briefly describe the ou and why VSP impleme implementation contri	tcome of the monitoring ntation/lack of ibuted to the observations	In tot or deg obtain imple	al, 54 sites were e gradation of weth ned and evaluated ementation.	evaluated a ands. This o d as part of	and this analysis d data source was s f the County's VSF	etected no loss pecifically ? Work Plan

Adaptive Management needed? 
Ves Vo

## Included Critical Area(s):

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Input datasets used	This analysis utilized Skagit County's high resolution aerial photography from EagleView
	(formerly Pictometry). The 2011 and 2017/2019 images were compared and intermediatry
	images were used to narrrow down findings. Skagit County has acquired these images ever two
	years starting in 2007.

Year of map/imagery for comparison with 2011 base	line 2019
Spatial accuracy of least accurate input layer	1 Units for spatial accuracy Feet
Classification accuracy of least accurate input layer	
Field verification of overall accuracy: Ommission	
Field verification of overall accuracy: Commission	
Field verification of overall accuracy: Kappa	
Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations	The monitoring identified specific vegetation losses to be investigated. This monitoring also quantified riparian gains and losses in the VSP Intersect area by WRIA and subbasin. This specific analysis is being completed to implement the County's VSP Work Plan.

Adaptive Management needed?	🗆 Yes	🗹 No
-----------------------------	-------	------