



County Basic Information

Please add in your basic information below regarding the main submitter of this report and the general information from the county's work group approval.

Submitter Full Name

Justin Bennett

Submitter Email

jbennett@masoncd.org

Report Type

5-Year Report

Report Period Ending Date

November 24, 2025

Date Submitted

12/31/2001

Has the county work group approved the content and submittal of this report?

Yes

County Work Group Approval Date

10/30/2025

Are you using regulatory backstop to protect any critical areas?

Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded

Please describe how the regulatory backstop(s) are protecting the applicable critical area(s)

Geologically hazardous areas are protected through several key state and local regulations that work together to reduce risks from erosion, landslides, and seismic activity. These backstops ensure that critical areas remain safeguarded even when voluntary or incentive-based conservation programs (like the VSP) are in place. Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58): Requires local Shoreline Master Programs to regulate development within 200 feet of shorelines, protecting against erosion and slope instability through stabilization standards, vegetation retention, and limits on grading and fill. State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C): Ensures proposed projects are reviewed for potential impacts to geologically hazardous areas. Agencies can require mitigation, modification, or denial of projects that would increase hazard risks. Building Codes and Grading Permits: Local enforcement of the International Building Code requires geotechnical review and design standards for construction in hazard zones, along with

erosion and slope stability measures for grading activities.

Supporting Regulations: The Forest Practices Act (RCW 76.09) prevents slope destabilization from timber operations, while Floodplain Management (RCW 86.16) restricts development in flood- and erosion-prone areas. FEMA mapping further supports local enforcement by identifying hazard zones.

Frequently Flooded Areas in Mason County are actually regulated under the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, which is incorporated under the Building Code and not part of the Resource Ordinance. While there are BMPs that can effectively protect agricultural operations from potential damage and loss, the regulations that guide development of any kind in frequently flooded areas remain in place. Additionally, Chapter 86.16 RCW provides for the administration of National Flood Insurance Program regulation by local governments.

Mason County operates under the International Building Code and International Residential Code, among others as required. These codes serve in a prescriptive manner that all structures be constructed appropriately for life and safety. These include codes specifically targeted for structures located in flood, landslide, and seismic hazard areas. The building codes adopted under Chapter 14 of the Mason County Code will remain in full force and effect for the protection of life and property.

Additionally, Mason County's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) applies to all the lands and waters that are designated in WAC 173-18, WAC173-20, and WAC 173-22 to be under the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act of 1971. This Work Plan developed under the State's Voluntary Stewardship Program will not replace those shoreline regulations. All regulations under the County's SMP still apply.

Did the watershed work group assert that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have been met during the past reporting period (e.g. 5 years)?

Protection Goals Met

Yes

Did the watershed work group assert that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have been met during the past reporting period (e.g. 5 years)?

Enhancement Goals Met

Yes

Summary Overview

Provide a summary of the major agricultural industries and examples of the primary conservation practices used in the watershed(s) to support agricultural viability.

The major agricultural industries within the watershed include livestock production (beef and dairy cattle, sheep, and poultry), forage and hay production, small-scale crop farming, and forestry-related agriculture such as timber and Christmas tree farms. In some lowland areas, specialty crops, greenhouses, and nursery operations also contribute to the local agricultural economy.

To support long-term agricultural viability while protecting natural resources, producers commonly implement a variety of conservation practices. Nutrient and manure management plans to prevent runoff and protect surface and groundwater quality. Riparian buffers and livestock exclusion fencing to reduce streambank erosion and enhance fish habitat. Cover cropping, rotational grazing, and residue management to maintain soil health and reduce erosion. Improved drainage, filter strips, and sediment control structures to manage stormwater and reduce pollutant loading.

Aquaculture and Commercial Timber make up the largest portions of Mason County Industry, Forest stand improvement and road maintenance practices to minimize sedimentation and maintain working forestlands.

These practices are often supported through NRCS conservation programs, local Conservation District initiatives, and voluntary stewardship planning, all aimed at maintaining the economic sustainability of agriculture while protecting soil, water, and habitat resources in the watershed.

Baseline bench mark data show In 2011, Mason County had a total of 7,985 acres of agricultural land. Of this, 3,808 acres were located within Critical Aquifer recharge areas (CARAs), 2,963 acres fell within frequently flooded areas (FFA) as identified in 2014. 1,470 acres interfaced with identified Wetlands, and 123 acres were in Erosion Hazard Areas (EHA). Additionally, 1,399 acres were included in Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (FWHCA) as mapped in 2017. These acreage counts can overlap between critical areas and will not sum to the exact acres of agricultural land.

Provide a summary of the major natural resource concerns and critical area protection and enhancement practices present in the watershed(s).

The watersheds of Mason County, face several natural resource concerns primarily related to water quality, and habitat integrity. Key concerns include sedimentation and erosion from agricultural and forestry activities, streambank destabilization, loss or degradation of riparian vegetation, fecal coliform, nutrient and pollutant runoff, and habitat fragmentation for salmon and other aquatic species. Flooding and landslide risks in steep or lowland areas also pose ongoing management challenges.

To address these issues, landowners and agencies implement a variety of critical area protection and enhancement practices. These include riparian buffers and vegetative plantings to stabilize streambanks and improve water quality, livestock exclusion fencing, heavy use areas and manure storage facilities to prevent channel damage and reduce runoff, along with cover cropping or rotational grazing. Stream restoration, culvert replacement, and wetland enhancement projects help restore aquatic connectivity and improve habitat conditions. In forestry and mixed-use lands, road maintenance, erosion control structures, and slope stabilization measures prevent sediment delivery to streams. Collectively, these practices help maintain watershed function, protect critical areas, and support both ecological and agricultural sustainability.

If desired, attach an image to support your summary. (Optional)



If desired, attach another image to support your summary. (Optional)





Please provide a summary of any VSP cost-share projects implemented in this 5 year period using Capital Funding.

The projects implemented in the last 5 years offer a variety of Best Management Practices (BMPs) aimed at protecting soil, water, and vegetation while managing agricultural and structural runoff. Fencing and Heavy Use Area Protection are extensively employed to control livestock access, minimize soil compaction, and protect sensitive areas. Multiple Roof Runoff Structures and Roofs and Covers are installed to manage precipitation, reduce erosion, and prevent contaminant-laden runoff. Waste Storage Facilities and Composting Facilities ensure proper handling and containment of manure and organic materials. Underground Outlets and Vegetated Treatment Areas help filter and convey stormwater safely. Capital projects also funded Hedgerow Planting, Riparian Forest Buffers, Tree/Shrub Establishment, and Silvopasture Establishment to enhance vegetation cover, improve habitat, and stabilize soil. Watering Facilities, Access Roads, and Trails and Walkways support operational needs while limiting environmental impact. Overall, these BMPs collectively promote sustainable land management, water quality protection, and ecological enhancement, and were targeted to promote voluntary stewardship of critical area and agricultural interface in Mason County. From VSP capital competitive funding and VSP supplemental funding Mason County requested \$838,131 and was awarded \$622,763. As of this report \$396,573 of the awarded funding has been spent on completed projects, \$226,189 of the awarded funds are still being implemented rounded to the nearest whole dollar. In addition, \$940,848 of non-VSP funds have been awarded for cost share projects on agricultural land, rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

Please provide a summary of any VSP cost-share projects implemented in this 5 year period using Operating Funding.

No VSP cost-share projects were funded with operation funding in this 5-year reporting cycle.

Goals Results

Below you will find all of your goals from your work plan. For each goal, indicate the type of goal, if the goal has been met, and a brief explanation. If you have goals that are not from your work plan, you can add those under Adaptive Management.

Goal Name:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011

For the above goal, choose the applicable WRIAs:

14-Kennedy-Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis

For the above goal, choose the applicable goal type:

Protection

For the above goal, was the goal met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

For the above goal, provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the goal was or was not met:

Implementation of the Mason VSP Watershed Workplan has shown baseline protection of critical area functions and values based on the set benchmarks, recorded baseline values, monitoring results and adaptive management. This benchmark has been met with 2025 data showing 10,008.64 acres of agriculture and critical area interface county wide compared to the 9763.5 acres recorded as the 2011 baseline, and some adaptive management is necessary or proposed at this time. Utilizing a Geographic Information System (GIS) Geoprocessing Intersect tool, the district was able to provide the total acreage of agriculture activities occurring in the County's critical areas for 2011, 2019, and 2024; then make a comparison of those totals revealing that the baseline of agricultural activities has been maintained and exceeded in some areas. Utilizing Washington's Department of Fish and Wildlife High Resolution Change Detection, land cover changes were also documented. The overall changes noted were minimal and were generally the result of mapped parcel expansions to include transportation Right of Way's and parcel boundary adjustments, infill of existing agricultural operations on a single parcel or with a single property owner, expanded agricultural operations, converted lands into agricultural use, and addition of existing activities not previously recorded or mapped. Outreach and on the ground verification have enabled more lesser-known agricultural activities to be identified and recorded for reporting and analysis. While baseline acreage intersect is maintained across the county, variations in critical area by watershed were identified, these changes have been addressed by increased targeted best management practice implementation in those areas. The assertions that baseline protection has been met is backed up by supporting monitoring data including; County environmental health well water quality reports, state of the watershed water quality monitoring by Mason County and Squaxin Island department of natural resources, LiDAR riparian buffer health analysis in WRIA 14, shellfish bed priority areas and closure reports, analysis of TMDL, 303d, and SWIFD area and stream length calculations by watershed, WSDA and USDA agricultural census, Salmon Enhancement Group, WRIA 14 Lead entity and other partner organizations shared identification of priority areas and implementation recommendations.

Goal Name:

Establish baseline monitoring program to measure benchmarks over a ten year period

For the above goal, choose the applicable WRIsAs:

14-Kennedy-Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis

For the above goal, choose the applicable goal type:

Protection, Enhancement, Participation, Agricultural Viability

For the above goal, was the goal met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

For the above goal, provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the goal was or was not met:

A baseline monitoring program has been established, implemented and adaptively managed to monitor benchmarks for protection, enhancement, participation and program effectiveness.

Goal Name:

Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses

For the above goal, choose the applicable WRIsAs:

14-Kennedy-Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis

For the above goal, choose the applicable goal type:

Agricultural Viability

For the above goal, was the goal met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

No

For the above goal, provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the goal was or was not met:

Implementation of the Mason VSP Watershed Workplan and baseline monitoring plan has shown an increase in agricultural acreage over time county wide, and by watershed compared to 2011 baseline, increased 24% or 2.4%/year on average based on WSDA and internally tracked landowner data. Agricultural census shows economic growth in line with and exceeding inflation. Population increases in the past ten years show newcomers are interested in maintaining and increasing agricultural activities. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the most populated and urban WRIA in the county only saw a 8.9% reduction in baseline acres since 2011. WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis only saw a 2.15% reduction in baseline acreage where WRIA 15 - Kitsap, saw 86.59% increase in acreage and WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips saw 21% increase.

Goal Name:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures

For the above goal, choose the applicable WRIs:

14-Kennedy-Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis

For the above goal, choose the applicable goal type:

Enhancement, Participation

For the above goal, was the goal met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

For the above goal, provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the goal was or was not met:

Support for this goal is demonstrated by increased BMP implementation, voluntary landowner participation, and watershed resource concern targeted cost-share projects, which collectively enhanced critical area functions as they existed in 2011. By providing incentives and technical assistance, landowners were motivated to adopt practices such as riparian fencing, waste storage management, and canopy restoration that improve water quality, stabilize soils, and support salmon and downstream shellfish habitat, showing that voluntary, incentive-based measures effectively strengthened ecological functions and values. Monitoring data shows improvement in key critical area function and value resource concerns in Mason County, such as wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat. The data is unclear for other critical area functions and values, and more data would be required to confidently assert met benchmarks had a measurable impact in those areas.

Benchmarks Results

Below you will be asked to give details on your benchmarks. Choose one benchmark at a time to provide information for each benchmark. For each benchmark, you can choose multiple goals, if multiple apply. For each benchmark, you can add multiple accomplishments, if it applies. For each accomplishment, you can choose multiple critical areas and WRIs, if applicable.

Note: Any protection or enhancement Benchmark results are recommended to have at least 1 Accomplishment added.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Maintain BMP Implementation

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011; Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses; Establish baseline monitoring program to measure benchmarks over a ten year period;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Protection,

Was the benchmark met?

Exceeded

Need Adaptive Management?

No

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

143

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

The reported implementation efforts contributed to meeting the goal and benchmark by exceeding the five-year target for installations, increasing from 143 target to 225 completed in the 5-year period from 2021-2025. A total 330 agriculture BMP's were completed during the 10-year period from 2016-2025. This overachievement demonstrates active progress toward enhancing voluntary stewardship and conservation practices. By installing additional projects, these activities directly protect and enhance critical area functions and values by improving water quality, reducing erosion, stabilizing soils, and providing habitat benefits. The increased installation rate ensures that more critical areas receive protective measures, supporting long-term ecological function and resilience. As implementation continues BMP's become targeted, watershed need tailored and often advancement of existing management strategies. Monitoring of baseline agriculture and critical area interface informs us where to focus best management practice efforts, funding, and recommendations.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Maintain BMP Implementation

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Use participation, survey outreach, and critical area monitoring data to inform implementation of NRCS best management practice on agricultural land that intersects with critical areas to target critical areas for protection and enhancement of functions and values within a watershed. Work with local partners and monitoring efforts to tailor implementation to shared protection goals.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 34 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 19 facility units, 189.11 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 92 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 39 facility units, 137.89 acres, and 33909 feet. This represents an annual average change of 17.06%, 10.76%, -2.71%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas

consisted of 28 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 64.85 acres, and 13869.2 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 56 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 8 facility units, 127.21 acres, and 35227 feet. This represents an annual average change of 10%, 0%, 9.61%, and 15.4% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 11 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 30 facility units, 36.97 acres, and 302.45 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 95 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 33 facility units, 159.95 acres, and 47259.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 76.36%, 0.89%, 33.26%, and 1552.54% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 34 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 5 facility units, 19.7 acres, and 13566.75 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 103 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 39 facility units, 275.64 acres, and 46569.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 20.29%, 70.43%, 129.93%, and 24.33% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 9 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 35 facility units, 16.97 acres, and 13869.2 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 84 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 23 facility units, 276.81 acres, and 44104.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 83.33%, -3.34%, 153.1%, and 21.8% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 21 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 1 facility units, 13.12 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 36 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 11 facility units, 76.73 acres, and 18890 feet. This represents an annual average change of 7.14%, 74.39%, 48.49%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas consisted of 7 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 4.5 acres, and 962.17 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 22 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 5 facility units, 43.83 acres, and 19700 feet. This represents an annual average change of 21.43%, 0%, 87.42%, and 194.75% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 2 facility units, 2.56 acres, and 20.98 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 44 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 15 facility units, 107.53 acres, and 19880 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, 61.35%, 409.22%, and 9464.56% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 36 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 0 facility units, 1.37 acres, and 941.19 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 67 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 153.04 acres, and 19880 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.61%, 435.91%, 1109.86%, and 201.22% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 3 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 2 facility units, 1.18 acres, and 962.17 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 63 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 14 facility units, 152.94 acres, and 19800 feet. This represents an annual average change of 200%, 48.41%, 1288.99%, and 195.79% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 28

counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 7 facility units, 66.6 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 25 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 5 facility units, 53.95 acres, and 6414 feet. This represents an annual average change of -1.07%, -2.44%, -1.9%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas consisted of 26 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 22.84 acres, and 4884.48 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 15 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 1 facility units, 61.05 acres, and 12274 feet. This represents an annual average change of -4.23%, 0%, 16.73%, and 15.13% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 11 facility units, 13.02 acres, and 106.52 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 58 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 13 facility units, 210.87 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, 2.18%, 151.94%, and 1145.11% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 46 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 2 facility units, 6.94 acres, and 4777.96 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 86 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 550.95 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.7%, 77.84%, 784.15%, and 15.75% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 3 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 12 facility units, 5.98 acres, and 4884.48 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 88 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 13 facility units, 823.85 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 283.33%, 0.68%, 1368.37%, and 15.19% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 3 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 4 facility units, 43.17 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 4 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 2 facility units, 25.23 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 3.33%, -5.34%, -4.16%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas consisted of 1 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 14.81 acres, and 3166.16 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 3 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 2 facility units, 25.23 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 20%, 0%, 7.04%, and 23.29% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 7 facility units, 8.44 acres, and 69.05 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 3 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 2 facility units, 25.23 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, -7.11%, 19.89%, and 1516.52% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 7 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 1 facility units, 4.5 acres, and 3097.11 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 5 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 2 facility units, 29.93 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of -2.86%, 8.07%, 56.56%, and 24.03% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 0 counts of

individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 8 facility units, 3.87 acres, and 3166.16 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 5 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 2 facility units, 29.93 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, - 7.46%, 67.25%, and 23.29% respectively.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

143

Target Metric Unit

10 year count

Target Metric Item

Best Management Practices

Result Metric Number

330

Result Metric Unit

10 year count

Result Metric Item

Best Management Practices

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Exceeded

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

The goal to maintain a 5-year implementation rate of 143 total NRCS best management practices on agriculture critical area interface land has been met and exceeded with 225 total NRCS best management practices installed from 2021-2025. A total of 330 practices were installed between 2016-2025.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

Internal BMP tracking, CPDS, NRCS, and partner organization. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Monitoring data was able to show exceedence to tracked and installed BMP's over the time period.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Protection,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

9763.50 Acres

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Maintaining the baseline acreage of agriculture within the Critical Area Interface protects and enhances critical area functions and values by preventing the conversion of agricultural lands into more intensive or impervious uses that can degrade water quality, increase runoff, and fragment habitat. Sustaining agricultural use in these areas supports soil health, infiltration, and vegetative cover, which help filter pollutants and maintain hydrologic function. Continued agricultural viability also encourages stewardship and participation in voluntary conservation practices that improve riparian buffers, reduce erosion, and enhance habitat connectivity. By keeping agricultural land in production and preventing unmanaged development pressures, the County ensures long-term protection of water resources, fish and wildlife habitat, and other critical area functions.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Critical Aquifer Recharge,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 21-Queets-Quinault, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

in 2011, 47.73% of agricultural land intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Area. In 2025, 60.51% of agricultural land intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Area. In 2011, this intersect accounted for 3.15% of all Critical Aquifer Recharge Area acreage in the county, in 2025, this status is maintained at 5.08% intersect of all Critical Aquifer Recharge Area acreage. The moderate increase of 1140 acres of intersect county wide is consistent with population growth trends, and the 24% increase of agriculture in mason county from 2011-2025. With little change in Critical Aquifer Recharge county wide, this result suggests encroachment of agriculture on Critical Aquifer Recharge.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

48

Target Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Target Metric Item

CARA Agriculture Interface baseline 2011

Result Metric Number

61

Result Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Result Metric Item

CARA Agriculture Interface baseline 2025

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Not Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 21-Queets-Quinault, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

in 2011, 18.43% of agricultural land intersected with Wetland. In 2025, 10.24% of agricultural land intersected with Wetland. In 2011, this intersect accounted for 2.52% of all Wetland acreage in the county, in 2025, this status is maintained at 2.11% intersect of all Wetland acreage. The moderate decrease of 633.15 acres of intersect is consistent with wetland data monitoring showing a 32% decrease in wetland acreage county wide, and may suggest agricultural activities are being performed elsewhere but more data is needed.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

18.4

Target Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Target Metric Item

Wetland Agriculture Interface baseline 2011

Result Metric Number

10.24

Result Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Result Metric Item

Wetland Agriculture Interface baseline 2025

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

More data required

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 21-Queets-Quinault, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

in 2011, 17.52% of agricultural land intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area. In 2025, 15.19% of agricultural land intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area. In 2011, this intersect accounted for 5.03% of all Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area acreage in the county, in 2025, this status is maintained at 3.7% intersect of all Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area acreage. The slight decrease of 156.46 acres in intersect suggests agriculture activities moving away from critical Fish and Wildlife Habitat when compared to the 21% increase in critical fish and wildlife habitat acres county wide.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

17.52

Target Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Target Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat areas Agriculture Interface baseline 2011

Result Metric Number

15.19

Result Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Result Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat areas Agriculture Interface baseline 2025

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Geologically Hazardous,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 21-Queets-Quinault, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of Geologically Hazardous areas on agricultural land. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

in 2011, 1.54% of agricultural land intersected with Erosion Hazard Area. In 2025, 1.93% of agricultural land intersected with Erosion Hazard Area. In 2011, this intersect accounted for 0.73% of all Geologically Hazardous acreage in the county, in 2025, this status is maintained at 0.94% intersect of all Erosion Hazard Area acreage. The minimal change of 34.84 acres is consistent with maintaining baseline acreage of interface.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

1.54

Target Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Target Metric Item

EHA Agriculture Interface baseline 2011

Result Metric Number

1.93

Result Metric Unit

Percent Acre Interface

Result Metric Item

EHA Agriculture Interface baseline 2025

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:
Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:
14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 21-Queets-Quinault, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:
Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:
in 2011, 37.12% of agricultural land intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas. In 2025, 34.54% of agricultural land intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas. In 2011, this intersect accounted for 4.82% of all Frequently Flooded acreage in the county, in 2025, this status is maintained at 4.57% intersect of all Frequently Flooded Areas acreage. The minimal change of -137.29 intersecting acres is consistent with maintaining baseline average of interface.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number
37.1

Target Metric Unit
Percent Acre Interface

Target Metric Item
FFA Agriculture Interface baseline 2011

Result Metric Number
34.54

Result Metric Unit
Percent Acre Interface

Result Metric Item
FFA Agriculture Interface baseline 2025

Choose applicable NRCS BMP
If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Critical Aquifer Recharge,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Critical Aquifer Recharge Area Gained 780.23 acres since 2011. This represents a 83.39% Increase in overlap from the 24.06% acres intersect in 2011 to the 44.13% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -1.28% minor Change in watershed wide Critical Aquifer Recharge Area this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

1164.7

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

1944.92

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Not Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Critical Aquifer Recharge,

WRIs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Critical Aquifer Recharge Area Gained 75.14 acres since 2011. This represents a -18.28% Decrease in overlap from the 42.64% acres intersect in 2011 to the 34.85% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -0.89% minor Change in watershed wide Critical Aquifer Recharge Area this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

143.2

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

218.343

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Critical Aquifer Recharge,

WRIAs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Critical Aquifer Recharge Area Gained 347.19 acres since 2011. This represents a 1.36% Minor Change in overlap from the 88.32% acres intersect in 2011 to the 89.52% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 2.3% minor Change in watershed wide Critical Aquifer Recharge Area this Minor Change in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

1505.6

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

1852.79

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Critical Aquifer Recharge,

WRIs:

22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Critical Aquifer Recharge Area Lost -62.52 acres since 2011. This represents a -4.22% Minor Change in overlap from the 90.07% acres intersect in 2011 to the 86.27% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 0.28% minor Change in watershed wide Critical Aquifer Recharge Area this Minor Change in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

995.3

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

932.78

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Geologically Hazardous,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of Geologically Hazardous areas on agricultural land. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Lost -31.56 acres since 2011. This represents a -35.61% Decrease in overlap from the 1.58% acres intersect in 2011 to the 1.02% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -1.52% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

76.3

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

44.739

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Geologically Hazardous,

WRIAs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of Geologically Hazardous areas on agricultural land. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Gained 4.9 acres since 2011. This represents a -8.92% Minor Change in overlap from the 2.08% acres intersect in 2011 to the 1.9% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 2.21% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Minor Change in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained. Additionally,

HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

7

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

11.896

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Geologically Hazardous,

WRIAs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of Geologically Hazardous areas on agricultural land. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Gained 61.06 acres since 2011. This represents a 111% Increase in overlap from the 2.29% acres intersect in 2011 to the 4.84% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -2.49% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

39.1

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

100.161

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Geologically Hazardous,

WRIAs:

22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for

baseline protection of Geologically Hazardous areas on agricultural land. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Gained 0.44 acres since 2011. This represents a 113.9% Increase in overlap from the 0.04% acres intersect in 2011 to the 0.08% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 0.06% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

0.4

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

0.8372

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of frequently flooded areas on agricultural land.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Frequently Flooded Areas Lost -327.03 acres since 2011. This represents a -21.02% Decrease in overlap from the 24.06% acres intersect in 2011 to the 19% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 37.23% increase in watershed wide Frequently Flooded Areas this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

1164.7

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

837.667

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of frequently flooded areas on agricultural land.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Frequently Flooded Areas Gained 14.84 acres since 2011. This represents a -40.85% Decrease in overlap from the 42.64% acres intersect in 2011 to the 25.22% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 1.6% minor Change in watershed wide Frequently Flooded Areas this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

143.2

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

158.03

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of frequently flooded areas on agricultural land.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Frequently Flooded Areas Gained 133.24 acres since 2011. This represents a -9.35% Minor Change in overlap from the 77.69% acres intersect in 2011 to the 70.42% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -19.77% decrease in watershed wide Frequently Flooded Areas this Minor Change in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. Increases in acreage of intersect demand more attention towards BMP's identified in the workplan as enhancing associated critical areas. Our implementation saw significant increases in these demands to support the protection and enhancement of critical area functions and values.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

1324.3

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

1457.539

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:

22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements. The Mason County VSP workplan relies on existing policy for baseline protection of frequently flooded areas on agricultural land.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Frequently Flooded Areas Gained 38.28 acres since 2011. This represents a 14.04% Increase in overlap from the 29.9% acres intersect in 2011 to the 34.1% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 0.55% minor Change in watershed wide Frequently Flooded Areas this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCID identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

330.4

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

368.675

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP
If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:
Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Lost -409.26 acres since 2011. This represents a -44.59% Decrease in overlap from the 17.06% acres intersect in 2011 to the 9.45% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -51.34% decrease in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses or may suggest agricultural activities are being performed elsewhere but more data is needed. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

826

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

416

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

More data required

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Gained 19.08 acres since 2011. This represents a -35.49% Decrease in overlap from the 27.9% acres intersect in 2011 to the 18% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -28.47% decrease in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses. The minimal acreage change over a ten-year period leads us to agree the interface is maintained. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

93.7

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

112.78

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIAs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Lost -127.46 acres since 2011. This represents a -45.45% Decrease in overlap from the 22.14% acres intersect in 2011 to the 12.08% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -15.33% decrease in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses, or agricultural activities have moved out of wetland intersect, more data would be required to confirm the latter. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

377.4

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

249.9

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIsAs:

22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Lost -115.21 acres since 2011. This represents a -65.78% Decrease in overlap from the 15.67% acres intersect in 2011 to the 5.36% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 4.56% minor Change in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

173.2

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item
Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number
57.99

Result Metric Unit
Acres

Result Metric Item
Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP
If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:
Accomplishment Status
Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:
Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIs:
14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:
Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:
In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas Lost -452.79 acres since 2011. This represents a -45.73% Decrease in overlap from the 18.49% acres intersect in 2011 to the 10.04% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -53.66% decrease in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

895.1

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

442.31

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas Lost - 14.28 acres since 2011. This represents a -79.83% Decrease in overlap from the 6.82% acres intersect in 2011 to the 1.38% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 375.52% increase in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

22.9

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

8.619

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Exceeded

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIAs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas Gained 310.87 acres since 2011. This represents a 35.6% Increase in overlap from the 28.22% acres intersect in 2011 to the 38.26% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -10.75% decrease in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up

only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. Increases in acreage of intersect demand more attention towards BMP's identified in the workplan as enhancing associated critical areas. Our implementation saw significant increases in this demands to support the protection and enhancement of critical area functions and values. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

481

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

791.874

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Not Met

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIAs:

22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts

include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas changed 0 acres since 2011. This represents a 0% Minor Change in overlap from the 0% acres intersect in 2011 to the 0% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 0% minor Change in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Minor Change in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

0

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Result Metric Number

0

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Critical Area Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

This benchmark has been met with 2025 data showing 10,008.64 acres of agriculture and critical area interface county wide (counting each critical area acreage includes overlaps), and some adaptive management is necessary or proposed at this time. Utilizing a Geographic Information System (GIS) Geoprocessing Intersect tool, the district was able to provide the total acreage of agriculture activities occurring in the County's critical areas for both 2011, 2019, and 2024; then make a comparison of those totals revealing that the baseline of agricultural activities has been maintained and exceeded in some areas. Utilizing Washington's Department of Fish and Wildlife High Resolution Change Detection, land cover changes were also documented. The overall changes noted were minimal and do not warrant adaptive management. These changes were generally the result of

mapped parcel expansions to include transportation Right of Way's and parcel boundary adjustments, infill of existing agricultural operations on a single parcel or with a single property owner, expanded agricultural operations, converted lands into agricultural use, and addition of existing activities not previously recorded or mapped. Outreach and on the ground verification have enabled more lesser-known agricultural activities to be identified and recorded for reporting and analysis.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

ArcGIS Pro Spatial Analysis Tools, Field GIS ground verification, publicly available data analysis. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Spatial analysis results show maintaining acreage of agriculture and critical area interface when controlled for non-ag changes, population growth, normalized to county wide, state-wide, and national change factors. results in accomplishments.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Maintain 7.5 completed farm plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) per year

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011; Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Protection, Participation, Agricultural Viability,

Was the benchmark met?

Exceeded

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

7.5 annual average

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

The Mason VSP workplan sets a goal of baseline protection to an average of 7.5 plans per year from the 5-year average identified in 2011. County Wide, we have maintained, an exceeded this goal in the 10-year period from 2016-2025 the district and county partners maintained an annual average of 23 NRCS farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP) for a total of 234. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025 an annual average 24 plans made a 5-year total of 123. by-watershed breakdowns listed in benchmark accomplishments and in attachments referenced below. The district will continue to update the landowner tracking system to obtain accurate reporting

of Farm Plans on eligible properties. Adaptive management for the 2025-2030 reporting period is being considered regarding the limitations on eligible cooperators for this metric. The reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark by maintaining and updating a comprehensive landowner database, tracking agricultural operators served, and ensuring Farm Plans are implemented on eligible properties. By continuing to develop and refine the landowner tracking system, the district improves accuracy in reporting and identifies opportunities for additional engagement. These activities protect and enhance critical area functions and values by promoting sustainable agricultural practices that reduce erosion, maintain soil health, conserve water quality, and support habitat integrity, ensuring that agricultural operations are compatible with the ecological functions of critical areas.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Maintain 7.5 completed farm plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) per year

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:

Protect Critical Area functions and values on agricultural land as they existed in 2011 by maintaining voluntary landowner participation through NRCS Farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP). Maintain target of average 7.5 farm plans per year.

Accomplishment:

Annual average of 14.3 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 14-Kennedy - Goldsborough from 2016-2025 for a total of 143 plans Annual average of 12.8 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 14-Kennedy - Goldsborough from 2021-2025 for a total of 64 plans Agriculture in WRIA 14-Kennedy - Goldsborough makes up 60.61% of agriculture acres in Mason County.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

4.5

Target Metric Unit

Annual Average

Target Metric Item

Farm Plans

Result Metric Number

14.3

Result Metric Unit

Annual Average

Result Metric Item

Farm Plans

Choose applicable NRCS BMP
If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Exceeded

Benchmark: Maintain 7.5 completed farm plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) per year

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Protect Critical Area functions and values on agricultural land as they existed in 2011 by maintaining voluntary landowner participation through NRCS Farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP). Maintain target of average 7.5 farm plans per year.

Accomplishment:

Annual average of 3.8 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 15-Kitsap from 2016-2025 for a total of 38 plans
Annual average of 4 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 15-Kitsap from 2021-2025 for a total of 20 plans
Agriculture in WRIA 15-Kitsap makes up 4.20% of agriculture acres in Mason County.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

1

Target Metric Unit

Annual Average

Target Metric Item

Farm Plans

Result Metric Number

3.8

Result Metric Unit

Annual Average

Result Metric Item

Farm Plans

Choose applicable NRCS BMP
If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:
Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Maintain 7.5 completed farm plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) per year

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Protect Critical Area functions and values on agricultural land as they existed in 2011 by maintaining voluntary landowner participation through NRCS Farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP). Maintain target of average 7.5 farm plans per year.

Accomplishment:

Annual average of 4.3 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips from 2016-2025 for a total of 43 plans Annual average of 7.6 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips from 2021-2025 for a total of 38 plans Agriculture in WRIA 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips makes up 21.34% of agriculture acres in Mason County.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

1.6

Target Metric Unit

Annual Average

Target Metric Item

Farm Plans

Result Metric Number

4.3

Result Metric Unit

Annual Average

Result Metric Item
Farm Plans

Choose applicable NRCS BMP
If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:
Accomplishment Status
Met

Benchmark: Maintain 7.5 completed farm plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) per year

Critical Areas:
Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:
22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:
Protect Critical Area functions and values on agricultural land as they existed in 2011 by maintaining voluntary landowner participation through NRCS Farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP). Maintain target of average 7.5 farm plans per year.

Accomplishment:
Annual average of 4.3 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 22-Lower Chehalis 2016-2025 for a total of 1 plans
Annual average of 7.6 NRCS Farm plans in WRIA 22-Lower Chehalis 2021-2025 for a total of 1 plans
Agriculture in WRIA 22-Lower Chehalis makes up 13.83% of agriculture acres in Mason County.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number
1

Target Metric Unit
Annual Average

Target Metric Item
Farm Plans

Result Metric Number
1

Result Metric Unit
Annual Average

Result Metric Item

Farm Plans

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

The county was able to implement 123 NRCS farm plans or NRCS farm plan updates in the 5-year period from 2021 to 2025. Both 10-year and 5-year annual averages meet and exceed workplan benchmarks and adaptively managed data updates.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

Conservation district internal tracking landowner and partner databases.

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Monitoring data results showed 123 NRCS farm plan or NRCS farm plan updates in the 5-year period from 2021 to 2025. VSP 2025 5-year report Appendices (Supplemental Attachment): Table 8 Watershed Counts of BMP's, ISP, and ISP Surveys Page 10

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Maintain outreach to all operators annually

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011; Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses; Establish baseline monitoring program to measure benchmarks over a ten year period;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Protection, Participation, Agricultural Viability,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

No

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

No Monitoring Metrics

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Maintaining annual outreach to all operators contributes to meeting this goal and benchmark by ensuring consistent communication, education, and engagement with agricultural landowners. Regular outreach helps landowners implement best management practices, participate in Farm Plans, and remain informed about conservation opportunities, directly supporting the district's benchmarks for stewardship and agricultural viability. These activities protect and enhance critical area functions and values by promoting practices that reduce soil erosion, protect water quality, maintain riparian and wetland habitats, and support long-term ecological health across agricultural land.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Maintain outreach to all operators annually

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 21-Queets-Quinault, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

This benchmark has no metrics for monitoring. However, there is a list of accomplishments the district has made during implementation of the Work Plan that would indicate this benchmark has been met up to this point. See also ISP checklist monitoring for further evidentiary support.

Accomplishment:

Regular site visits and technical assistance to local agricultural operations Over 1000 VSP returnable flyers mailed out to Agricultural operators countywide. 2000 VSP survey post-cards to priority outreach areas seeking engagement from small family farms on critical areas. Promotion of VSP at multiple county annual events. Regular Social Media campaigns. Participant signage and stickers. Increasing cost share rates for VSP participants from 75% to 90%, as well as district base cost share rates from 75% to 80% for incentive for participation. Ongoing communications with County officials. Permanent outreach signage at public agricultural hot spots and business centers. Partnership with local tractor club's no-till seed drill rental program. Partnership with local tribal farm community engagement events.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

0

Target Metric Unit

Target Metric Item

Result Metric Number

0

Result Metric Unit

Result Metric Item
Choose applicable NRCS BMP
If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:
Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

This Benchmark was met though various evolving outreach strategies and is supported by other monitoring metrics such as BMP implementation, NRCS farm plan participation and ISP checklist surveys.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

No

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

NA

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

NA

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

5% annual increase of BMP implementation (based on averaged annual implementation over 5 year period of each BMP through the County)

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Enhancement,

Was the benchmark met?

Exceeded

Need Adaptive Management?

No

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

28.6 averaged annual BMP implementation counts over 5-year period

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

The reported implementation efforts contributed to meeting the goal and benchmark by exceeding the five-year target for installations, increasing from 28.6 average annual target to 45 average annual completed in the 5-year period from 2021-2025, a 57% increase, or 11% average annual increase. A total 33 average annual agriculture

BMP's were completed during the 10-year period from 2016-2025, representing a 15% increase and 1.5% average annual increase. This overachievement demonstrates active progress toward enhancing voluntary stewardship and conservation practices. By installing additional projects, these activities directly protect and enhance critical area functions and values by improving water quality, reducing erosion, stabilizing soils, and providing habitat benefits. The increased installation rate ensures that more critical areas receive protective measures, supporting long-term ecological function and resilience. As implementation continues BMP's become targeted, watershed need tailored and often advancement of existing management strategies. Monitoring of baseline agriculture and critical area interface informs us where to focus best management practice efforts, funding, and recommendations.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: 5% annual increase of BMP implementation (based on averaged annual implementation over 5 year period of each BMP through the County)

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Changing watershed needs, Increases in acreage of intersect, and monitoring results demand more attention towards BMP's identified in the workplan as enhancing associated critical areas. Our implementation saw significant increases in this demands to support the protection and enhancement of critical area functions and values.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 34 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 19 facility units, 189.11 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 92 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 39 facility units, 137.89 acres, and 33909 feet. This represents an annual average change of 17.06%, 10.76%, -2.71%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas consisted of 28 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 64.85 acres, and 13869.2 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 56 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 8 facility units, 127.21 acres, and 35227 feet. This represents an annual average change of 10%, 0%, 9.61%, and 15.4% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 11 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 30 facility units, 36.97 acres, and 302.45 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 95 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 33 facility units, 159.95 acres, and 47259.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 76.36%, 0.89%, 33.26%, and 1552.54% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 34 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 5 facility

units, 19.7 acres, and 13566.75 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 103 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 39 facility units, 275.64 acres, and 46569.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 20.29%, 70.43%, 129.93%, and 24.33% respectively. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 9 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 35 facility units, 16.97 acres, and 13869.2 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 84 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 23 facility units, 276.81 acres, and 44104.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 83.33%, -3.34%, 153.1%, and 21.8% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 21 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 1 facility units, 13.12 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 36 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 11 facility units, 76.73 acres, and 18890 feet. This represents an annual average change of 7.14%, 74.39%, 48.49%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas consisted of 7 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 4.5 acres, and 962.17 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 22 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 5 facility units, 43.83 acres, and 19700 feet. This represents an annual average change of 21.43%, 0%, 87.42%, and 194.75% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 2 facility units, 2.56 acres, and 20.98 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 44 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 15 facility units, 107.53 acres, and 19880 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, 61.35%, 409.22%, and 9464.56% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 36 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 0 facility units, 1.37 acres, and 941.19 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 67 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 153.04 acres, and 19880 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.61%, 435.91%, 1109.86%, and 201.22% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 3 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 2 facility units, 1.18 acres, and 962.17 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 63 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 14 facility units, 152.94 acres, and 19800 feet. This represents an annual average change of 200%, 48.41%, 1288.99%, and 195.79% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 28 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 7 facility units, 66.6 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 25 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 5 facility units, 53.95 acres, and 6414 feet. This represents an annual average change of -1.07%, -2.44%, -1.9%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas consisted of 26 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 22.84 acres, and 4884.48 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 15 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 1 facility units, 61.05 acres, and 12274 feet. This represents an annual average change of -4.23%, 0%, 16.73%, and 15.13% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion

Hazard Areas installing 11 facility units, 13.02 acres, and 106.52 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 58 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 13 facility units, 210.87 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, 2.18%, 151.94%, and 1145.11% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 46 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 2 facility units, 6.94 acres, and 4777.96 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 86 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 550.95 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.7%, 77.84%, 784.15%, and 15.75% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 3 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 12 facility units, 5.98 acres, and 4884.48 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 88 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 13 facility units, 823.85 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 283.33%, 0.68%, 1368.37%, and 15.19% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas consisted of 3 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas installing 4 facility units, 43.17 acres, and 0 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaled 4 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas totaling 2 facility units, 25.23 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 3.33%, -5.34%, -4.16%, and 0% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Frequently Flooded Areas consisted of 1 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas installing 0 facility units, 14.81 acres, and 3166.16 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Frequently Flooded Areas totaled 3 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Frequently Flooded Areas totaling 2 facility units, 25.23 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 20%, 0%, 7.04%, and 23.29% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 7 facility units, 8.44 acres, and 69.05 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 3 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 2 facility units, 25.23 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, -7.11%, 19.89%, and 1516.52% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 7 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 1 facility units, 4.5 acres, and 3097.11 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 5 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 2 facility units, 29.93 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of -2.86%, 8.07%, 56.56%, and 24.03% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 8 facility units, 3.87 acres, and 3166.16 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 5 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 2 facility units, 29.93 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, -7.46%, 67.25%, and 23.29% respectively.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

28.6

Target Metric Unit

average annual count

Target Metric Item

best management practices

Result Metric Number

45

Result Metric Unit

average annual count

Result Metric Item

best management practices

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

Nutrient Management Plan - Written (104); Waste Storage Facility (313); Brush Management (314); Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility (319); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); High Tunnel System (325); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Residue Management, No-Till/Strip Till (329A); Residue Management, Mulch Till (329B); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till (345); Dam, Diversion (348); Sediment Basin (350); Dike and Levee (356); Diversion (362); Roofs and Covers (367); Pond (378); Silvopasture (381); Fence (382); Field Border (386); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Dam (402); Grade Stabilization Structure (410); Grassed Waterway (412); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation Water Conveyance (430); Above Ground, Multi-Outlet Pipeline (431); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation Water Management (449); Access Control (472); Mulching (484); Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490); Obstruction Removal (500); Forage Harvest Management (511); Pasture and Hay Planting (512); Livestock Pipeline (516); Prescribed Grazing (528); Drainage Water Management (554); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Access Road (560); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Channel Bed Stabilization (584); Structure for Water Control (587); Nutrient Management (590); Pest Management Conservation System (595); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Waste Utilization (633); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Wildlife Watering Facility (648); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

The goal to enhance a 5-year average annual implementation rate of 28.6 total NRCS best management practices on agriculture critical area interface land by 5% per year has been met and exceeded with 45 average annual NRCS best management practices installed from 2021-2025. A total of 33 average annual practices were installed between 2016-2025.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

Internal BMP tracking, CPDS, NRCS, and partner organization. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Monitoring data was able to show exceedence to tracked and installed BMP's over the time period, including a shift in practice type and amount toward priority areas suhc as those focused on water quality functions and values. Implementation moved in tandem with local partner and monitoring organization goals, plans, and recommendations. See Supplemental Attachment: References Page 23

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Return rate of 15 ISP Checklists per year

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Participation,

Was the benchmark met?

Exceeded

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

15 ISP checklists (survey) per year

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Maintaining a return rate of at least 15 ISP checklist surveys per year contributes to meeting this goal and benchmark by providing consistent data on agricultural practices and land use trends. This information allows the program to track participation in voluntary stewardship activities, identify resource concerns, and guide adaptive management efforts. By regularly collecting this information, the district can ensure that conservation practices are effectively implemented and maintained, thereby protecting water quality, agriculture, and habitat functions within critical areas.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Return rate of 15 ISP Checklists per year

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Promote annual participation in ISP checklist surveys through direct outreach, follow-up reminders, and coordination with agricultural operators. Use existing landowner databases and field visits to encourage timely survey completion. Track responses to identify trends, update records, and target technical assistance where needed to support voluntary conservation practices that protect and enhance critical area functions.

Accomplishment:

The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough at 14.3 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 17.6 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 18.6. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 23.08%. The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 15 - Kitsap at 2.2 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 4.6 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 5. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 109.09%. The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips at 2.8 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 5.5 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 9.4. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 96.43%. The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis at 1.5 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 2.5 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 2.2. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 66.67%. Results in Supplemental Attachment: Table 8 Watershed Counts of BMP's, ISP, and ISP Surveys Page 10

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

15

Target Metric Unit

average annual return

Target Metric Item

Individual Stewardship Plan Survey Checklists

Result Metric Number

30

Result Metric Unit

average annual return

Result Metric Item

Individual Stewardship Plan Survey Checklists

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Exceeded

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

In the 10-year period from 2016-2025, an average of 30 ISP checklist surveys were completed per year, for a total of 302. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025, an average of 35 ISP checklist surveys were completed for a total of 176. meeting the baseline participation benchmark for this protection goal.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

No

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?
How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Return rate of 23 ISP Checklists per year

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Participation,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

Return goal of 23 ISP Checklists per year

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Increasing the rate to 23 ISP checklist surveys per year strengthens progress toward this goal and benchmark by expanding the amount of data collected on agricultural stewardship practices and land use conditions. A higher response rate improves the district's ability to assess conservation practice implementation, identify emerging resource concerns, and guide adaptive management. These efforts enhance critical area functions and values by supporting more targeted technical assistance and promoting broader adoption of practices that protect water quality, maintain agricultural health, and improve habitat conditions.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Return rate of 23 ISP Checklists per year

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Promote annual participation in ISP checklist surveys through direct outreach, follow-up reminders, and coordination with agricultural operators. Use existing landowner databases and field visits to encourage timely survey completion. Track responses to identify trends, update records, and target technical assistance where needed to support voluntary conservation practices that protect and enhance critical area functions.

Accomplishment:

The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough at 14.3 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 17.6 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 18.6. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 23.08%. The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 15 - Kitsap at 2.2 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 4.6 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 5. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 109.09%. The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips at 2.8 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 5.5 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 9.4. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 96.43%. The 2011 baseline goal of average ISP survey checklists returned was set for WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis at 1.5 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average of returns was 2.5 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average return rate was 2.2. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average increase of 66.67%. Results in Supplemental Attachment: Table 8 Watershed Counts of BMP's, ISP, and ISP Surveys Page 10

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

23

Target Metric Unit

average annual return

Target Metric Item

Individual Stewardship Plan Survey Checklists

Result Metric Number

30

Result Metric Unit

average annual return

Result Metric Item

Individual Stewardship Plan Survey Checklists

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

In the 10-year period from 2016-2025, an average of 30 ISP checklist surveys were completed per year, for a total of 302. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025, an average of 35 ISP checklist surveys were completed for a total of 176, meeting the enhancement participation benchmark for this enhancement goal.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

No

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?
How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Increase annual number of completed Farm Plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) to 16

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures; Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Participation,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

2011 Baseline goal of increasing average annual Farm plans to 16

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

The Mason VSP workplan sets a goal of enhancement to increase an average of 7.5 plans per year from the 5-year average identified in 2011 to an average of 16 plans per year. County Wide, we have met this enhancement goal in the 10-year period from 2016-2025 the district and county partners maintained an annual average of 23 NRCS farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP) for a total of 234. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025 an annual average 24 plans made a 5-year total of 123. by-watershed breakdowns listed in benchmark accomplishments and in attachments referenced below. The district will continue to update the landowner tracking system to obtain accurate reporting of Farm Plans on eligible properties. Adaptive management for the 2025-2030 reporting period is being considered regarding the limitations on eligible cooperators for this metric. The reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark by maintaining and updating a comprehensive landowner database, tracking agricultural operators served, and ensuring Farm Plans are implemented on eligible properties. By continuing to develop and refine the landowner tracking system, the district improves accuracy in reporting and identifies opportunities for additional engagement. These activities protect and enhance critical area functions and values by promoting sustainable agricultural practices that reduce erosion, maintain soil health, conserve water quality, and support habitat integrity, ensuring that agricultural operations are compatible with the ecological functions of critical areas.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Increase annual number of completed Farm Plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) to 16

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Enhance Critical Area functions and values on agricultural land as they existed in 2011 by increasing voluntary landowner participation through NRCS Farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP). increase target of average 7.5 farm plans per year to 16 plans per year on average.

Accomplishment:

The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough at 14.3 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 14.3 for a total of 143 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 12.8 for a total of 64. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of 0%. Agriculture in WRIA 14-Kennedy - Goldsborough makes up 60.61% of agriculture acres in Mason County. The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 15 - Kitsap at 2.2 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 3.8 for a total of 38 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 4 for a total of 20. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of 72.73%. Agriculture in WRIA 15-Kitsap makes up 4.20% of agriculture acres in Mason County. The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips at 2.8 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 4.3 for a total of 43 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 7.6 for a total of 38. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of 53.57%. Agriculture in WRIA 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips makes up 21.34% of agriculture acres in Mason County. The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis at 1.5 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 1 for a total of 10 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 0.2 for a total of 1. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of - 33.33%. Agriculture in WRIA 22-Lower Chehalis makes up 13.83% of agriculture acres in Mason County.

Results in supplemental attachment: Source Tables Page 3 Table 8 Watershed Counts of BMP's, ISP, and ISP Surveys Page 10

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

16

Target Metric Unit

plans per year

Target Metric Item

NRCS Farm Plans or Individual Stewardship Plans

Result Metric Number

23

Result Metric Unit

plans per year

Result Metric Item

NRCS Farm Plans or Individual Stewardship Plans

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

County Wide, we have met this enhancement goal in the 10-year period from 2016-2025 the district and county partners maintained an annual average of 23 NRCS farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP) for a total of 234. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025 an annual average 24 plans made a 5-year total of 123. Both 10-year and 5-year annual averages meet workplan benchmarks for enhancement in participation.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

No

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Increase annual operator participation levels by 50%

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Participation,

Was the benchmark met?

More data required

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

No baseline in workplan for this entry

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

The Mason VSP workplan sets a goal of enhancement to increase annual operator participation levels by 50%. The workplan provides no clear baseline to apply the increase to but cites assumptions regarding the number of farm plans produced per known county operator. We have found this benchmark to be a flawed metric of success, since many farm plans can arise from a single operator, especially those that own multiple non-congruent parcels. By the 2011 assumptions in our workplan, participation counts were tied to farm plans, assuming the more farm plans made, the more county operator participation. County Wide, we have met this enhancement goal in the 10-year period from 2016-2025 the district and county partners maintained an annual average of 23 NRCS farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP) for a total of 234, from the 2011 baseline of 7.5 per year showing well over 50% increase in our count of annual operators from the 2011 baseline. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025 an annual average 24 plans made a 5-year total of 123. by-watershed breakdowns listed in benchmark accomplishments and in attachments referenced below. The district will continue to update the landowner tracking system to obtain accurate reporting of Farm Plans on eligible properties. Adaptive management for the 2025-2030 reporting period is proposed regarding the limitations on eligible cooperators for this metric. The reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark by maintaining and updating a comprehensive landowner database, tracking agricultural operators served, and ensuring Farm Plans are implemented on eligible properties. By continuing to develop and refine the landowner tracking system, the district improves accuracy in reporting and identifies opportunities for additional engagement. These activities protect and enhance critical area functions and values by promoting sustainable agricultural practices that reduce erosion, maintain soil health, conserve water quality, and support habitat integrity, ensuring that agricultural operations are compatible with the ecological functions of critical areas.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

No

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Maintain baseline acreage of Interface

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Agricultural Viability,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

No

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

7985.9 Acres

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Maintaining the baseline acreage of agriculture within the Critical Area Interface protects and enhances critical area functions and values by preventing the conversion of agricultural lands into more intensive or impervious uses that can degrade water quality, increase runoff, and fragment habitat. Sustaining agricultural use in these areas supports soil health, infiltration, and vegetative cover, which help filter pollutants and maintain hydrologic function. Continued agricultural viability also encourages stewardship and participation in voluntary conservation practices that improve riparian buffers, reduce erosion, and enhance habitat connectivity. By keeping agricultural land in production and preventing unmanaged development pressures, the County ensures long-term protection of water resources, fish and wildlife habitat, and other critical area functions.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Interface

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture Lost -432.78 acres since 2011. This represents a -8.94% Decrease in acres from the 4840.4 acres in 2011 to the 4407.62 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 2.67% of WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough in 2011, to 2.43% in 2025. This makes up 60.61% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture Gained 290.76 acres since 2011. This represents a 86.59% Increase in acres from the 335.8 acres in 2011 to the 626.56 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 0.28% of WRIA 15 - Kitsap in 2011, to 0.52% in 2025. This makes up 4.2% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture Gained 364.94 acres since 2011. This represents a 21.41% Increase in acres from the 1704.7 acres in 2011 to the 2069.64 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 0.74% of WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips in 2011, to 0.9% in 2025. This makes up 21.34% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture Lost -23.76 acres since 2011. This represents a -2.15% Decrease in acres from the 1105 acres in 2011 to the 1081.24 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 0.83% of WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis in 2011, to 0.82% in 2025. This makes up 13.83% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

7985.9

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Agriculture Intersect Critical Area

Result Metric Number

8185.05

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Agriculture Intersect Critical Area

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

This benchmark has been met with 2025 data showing 8185.05 acres of agriculture and critical area interface county wide, and some adaptive management is necessary or proposed at this time. Utilizing a Geographic Information System (GIS) Geoprocessing Intersect tool, the district was able to provide the total acreage of agriculture activities occurring in the County's critical areas for both 2011, 2019, and 2024; then make a comparison of those totals revealing that the baseline of agricultural activities has been maintained and exceeded in some areas. Utilizing Washington's Department of Fish and Wildlife High Resolution Change Detection, land cover changes were also documented. The overall changes noted were minimal and do not warrant adaptive management. These changes were generally the result of mapped parcel expansions to include transportation Right of Way's and parcel boundary adjustments, infill of existing agricultural operations on a single parcel or with a single property owner, expanded agricultural operations, converted lands into agricultural use, and addition of existing activities not previously recorded or mapped. Outreach and on the ground verification have enabled more lesser-known agricultural activities to be identified and recorded for reporting and analysis.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

ArcGIS Pro Spatial Analysis Tools, Field GIS ground verification, publicly available data analysis. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Spatial analysis results show maintaining acreage of agriculture and critical area interface when controlled for non-ag changes, population growth, normalized to county wide, state-wide, and national change factors. Results in accomplishments. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods. Increases in acreage of intersect demand more attention towards BMP's identified in the workplan as enhancing associated critical areas. Our implementation saw significant increases in this demands to support the protection and enhancement of critical area functions and values.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Maintain baseline acreage of Agricultural Activity

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Agricultural Viability,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

No

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

7985.9 Acres

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Maintaining the baseline acreage of agriculture within the Critical Area Interface protects and enhances critical area functions and values by preventing the conversion of agricultural lands into more intensive or impervious uses that can degrade water quality, increase runoff, and fragment habitat. Sustaining agricultural use in these areas supports soil health, infiltration, and vegetative cover, which help filter pollutants and maintain hydrologic function. Continued agricultural viability also encourages stewardship and participation in voluntary conservation practices that improve riparian buffers, reduce erosion, and enhance habitat connectivity. By keeping agricultural land in production and preventing unmanaged development pressures, the County ensures long-term protection of water resources, fish and wildlife habitat, and other critical area functions.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Maintain baseline acreage of Agricultural Activity

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Maintain baseline acreage of agricultural area and critical area within a watershed, efforts to maintain agricultural use, and maintain critical area overlap to protect conditions as existed in 2011. Efforts include information outreach, participation outreach, and BMP implementation to encourage agricultural use and protect critical area. Results tell us which strategies to implement for BMP and participation encouragements.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture Lost -432.78 acres since 2011. This represents a -8.94% Decrease in acres from the 4840.4 acres in 2011 to the 4407.62 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 2.67% of WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough in 2011, to 2.43% in 2025. This makes up 60.61% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCDC identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture Gained 290.76 acres since 2011. This represents a 86.59% Increase in acres from the 335.8 acres in 2011 to the 626.56 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 0.28% of WRIA 15 - Kitsap in 2011, to 0.52% in 2025. This makes up 4.2% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCDC identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture Gained 364.94 acres since 2011. This represents a 21.41% Increase in acres from the 1704.7 acres in 2011 to the 2069.64 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 0.74% of WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips in 2011, to

0.9% in 2025. This makes up 21.34% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture Lost -23.76 acres since 2011. This represents a -2.15% Decrease in acres from the 1105 acres in 2011 to the 1081.24 acres in 2025. Monitoring data shows agriculture made up 0.83% of WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis in 2011, to 0.82% in 2025. This makes up 13.83% of all agricultural acres in the county. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

7985.9

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Agriculture Intersect Critical Area

Result Metric Number

8185.05

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Agriculture Intersect Critical Area

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

This benchmark has been met with 2025 data showing 8185.05 acres of agriculture and critical area interface county wide, and some adaptive management is necessary or proposed at this time. Utilizing a Geographic Information System (GIS) Geoprocessing Intersect tool, the district was able to provide the total acreage of agriculture activities occurring in the County's critical areas for both 2011, 2019, and 2024; then make a comparison of those totals revealing that the baseline of agricultural activities has been maintained and exceeded in some areas. Utilizing Washington's Department of Fish and Wildlife High Resolution Change Detection, land cover changes were also documented. The overall changes noted were minimal and do not warrant adaptive management. These changes were generally the result of mapped parcel expansions to include transportation Right of Way's and parcel boundary adjustments, infill of existing agricultural operations on a single parcel or with a single property owner, expanded agricultural operations, converted lands into agricultural use, and addition of existing activities not previously recorded or mapped. Outreach and on the ground verification have enabled more lesser-known agricultural activities to be identified and recorded for reporting and analysis.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

ArcGIS Pro Spatial Analysis Tools, Field GIS ground verification, publicly available data analysis. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Spatial analysis results show maintaining acreage of agriculture and critical area interface when controlled for non-ag changes, population growth, normalized to county wide, state-wide, and national change factors. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods. Results in accomplishments.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Maintain 2011 annual average baseline of 7.5 completed Farm Plans

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Agricultural Viability,

Was the benchmark met?

Exceeded

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

7.5 Farm Plans implemented Annually

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

The Mason VSP workplan sets a goal of baseline protection to an average of 7.5 plans per year from the 5-year average identified in 2011. County Wide, we have maintained, an exceeded this goal in the 10-year period from 2016-2025 the district and county partners maintained an annual average of 23 NRCS farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP) for a total of 234. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025 an annual average 24 plans made a 5-year total of 123. by-watershed breakdowns listed in benchmark accomplishments and in attachments referenced below. The district will continue to update the landowner tracking system to obtain accurate reporting of Farm Plans on eligible properties. Adaptive management for the 2025-2030 reporting period is being considered regarding the limitations on eligible cooperators for this metric. The reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark by maintaining and updating a comprehensive landowner database, tracking agricultural operators served, and ensuring Farm Plans are implemented on eligible properties.

By continuing to develop and refine the landowner tracking system, the district improves accuracy in reporting and identifies opportunities for additional engagement. These activities protect and enhance critical area functions and values by promoting sustainable agricultural practices that reduce erosion, maintain soil health, conserve water quality, and support habitat integrity, ensuring that agricultural operations are compatible with the ecological functions of critical areas.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Maintain 2011 annual average baseline of 7.5 completed Farm Plans

Critical Areas:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Critical Aquifer Recharge, Geologically Hazardous, Frequently Flooded,

WRIsAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Ensure the viability of agriculture as it existed in 2011 by maintaining voluntary landowner participation through NRCS Farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP). Maintain target of average 7.5 farm plans per year.

Accomplishment:

The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough at 14.3 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 14.3 for a total of 143 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 12.8 for a total of 64. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of 0%. The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 15 - Kitsap at 2.2 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 3.8 for a total of 38 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 4 for a total of 20. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of 72.73%. The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips at 2.8 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 4.3 for a total of 43 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 7.6 for a total of 38. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of 53.57%. The 2011 average NRCS farm plans or Individual stewardship plans in WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis at 1.5 per year. From 2016-2025, the 10-year annual average completed plans was 1 for a total of 10 and for the 5-year period from 2021-2025 the annual average plan rate was 0.2 for a total of 1. Demonstrating a 10-year cumulative average change of -33.33%. Results in supplemental attachment: Source Tables Page 3 Table 8 Watershed Counts of BMP's, ISP, and ISP Surveys Page 10

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

7.5

Target Metric Unit

Annual Average

Target Metric Item

NRCS Farm Plans

Result Metric Number

23

Result Metric Unit

Annual Average

Result Metric Item

NRCS Farm Plans

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Exceeded

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

The county was able to implement 123 NRCS farm plans or NRCS farm plan updates with 57 unique project areas in the 5-year period from 2021 to 2025. Both 10-year and 5-year annual averages meet and exceed workplan benchmarks and adaptively managed data updates.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

Conservation district internal tracking landowner and partner databases

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Implementation monitoring data results showed 123 NRCS farm plan or NRCS farm plan updates within 57 unique project areas in the 5-year period from 2021 to 2025.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Enhancement,

Was the benchmark met?

More data required

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

1470.3 acres

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from wetland areas, reducing direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of wetland-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, waste storage or composting facilities, water runoff management, controlled livestock access and others, helps protect water quality and wetland integrity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve hydrologic function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife habitat. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and critical wetland interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting nutrient filtration, flood attenuation, downstream water quality, and biodiversity.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from wetland areas, reducing direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of wetland-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, waste storage or composting facilities, water runoff management, controlled livestock access and others, helps protect water quality and wetland integrity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve hydrologic function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife habitat. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and critical wetland interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting nutrient filtration, flood attenuation, downstream water quality, and biodiversity.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Lost -409.26 acres since 2011. This represents a -44.59% Decrease in overlap from the 17.06% acres intersect in 2011 to the 9.45% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -51.34% decrease in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up

only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 34 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 5 facility units, 19.7 acres, and 13566.75 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 103 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 39 facility units, 275.64 acres, and 46569.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 20.29%, 70.43%, 129.93%, and 24.33% respectively. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within these critical areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions despite agricultural overlap.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

826

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Result Metric Number

416.73

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (100); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (102); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan - Applied (103); Nutrient Management Plan - Written (104); Irrigation Water Management Plan - Written (118); Waste Storage Facility (313); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility (319); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Grassed Waterway (412); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Above Ground, Multi-Outlet Pipeline (431); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation Water Management (449); Access Control (472); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Vegetative Barrier (635); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIAs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from wetland areas, reducing direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of wetland-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, waste storage or composting facilities, water runoff management, controlled livestock access and others, helps protect water quality and wetland integrity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve hydrologic function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife habitat. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and critical wetland interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting nutrient filtration, flood attenuation, downstream water quality, and biodiversity.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Gained 19.08 acres since 2011. This represents a -35.49% Decrease in overlap from the 27.9% acres intersect in 2011 to the 18% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -28.47% decrease in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 36 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 0 facility units, 1.37 acres, and 941.19 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 67 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 153.04 acres, and 19880 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.61%, 435.91%, 1109.86%, and 201.22% respectively. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within these critical areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions despite agricultural overlap.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

93.7

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Result Metric Number

112.78

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Choose applicable NRCS BMP**If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:**

Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (100); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (102); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan - Applied (103); Nutrient Management Plan - Written (104); Irrigation Water Management Plan - Written (118); Waste Storage Facility (313); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility (319); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Grassed Waterway (412); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Above Ground, Multi-Outlet Pipeline (431); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation Water Management (449); Access Control (472); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Vegetative Barrier (635); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIAs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from wetland areas, reducing direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of wetland-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, waste storage or composting facilities, water runoff management, controlled livestock access and others, helps protect water quality and wetland integrity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve hydrologic function, native

vegetation cover, and wildlife habitat. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and critical wetland interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting nutrient filtration, flood attenuation, downstream water quality, and biodiversity.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Lost -127.46 acres since 2011. This represents a -45.45% Decrease in overlap from the 22.14% acres intersect in 2011 to the 12.08% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -15.33% decrease in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 46 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 2 facility units, 6.94 acres, and 4777.96 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 86 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 550.95 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.7%, 77.84%, 784.15%, and 15.75% respectively. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within these critical areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions despite agricultural overlap.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

377.4

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Result Metric Number

249.944

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (100); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (102); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan - Applied (103); Nutrient Management Plan - Written (104); Irrigation Water Management Plan - Written (118); Waste Storage Facility (313); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility (319); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342);

Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Grassed Waterway (412); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Above Ground, Multi-Outlet Pipeline (431); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation Water Management (449); Access Control (472); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Vegetative Barrier (635); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs

Critical Areas:

Wetlands,

WRIsAs:

22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from wetland areas, reducing direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of wetland-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, waste storage or composting facilities, water runoff management, controlled livestock access and others, helps protect water quality and wetland integrity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve hydrologic function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife habitat. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and critical wetland interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting nutrient filtration, flood attenuation, downstream water quality, and biodiversity.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Wetlands Lost -115.21 acres since 2011. This represents a -65.78% Decrease in overlap from the 15.67% acres intersect in 2011 to the 5.36% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 4.56% minor Change in watershed wide Wetlands this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 7 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 1 facility units, 4.5 acres, and 3097.11 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 5 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 2 facility units, 29.93 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of -2.86%, 8.07%, 56.56%, and 24.03% respectively. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within these critical areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions despite agricultural overlap.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

173.2

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Result Metric Number

57.99

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Wetland intersect

Choose applicable NRCS BMP**If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:**

Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (100); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (102); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan - Applied (103); Nutrient Management Plan - Written (104); Irrigation Water Management Plan - Written (118); Waste Storage Facility (313); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility (319); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Grassed Waterway (412); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Above Ground, Multi-Outlet Pipeline (431); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation Water Management (449); Access Control (472); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Vegetative Barrier (635); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

Accomplishment Status

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

Spatial analysis indicated a 632.85 acre decrease in wetland acre intersect on agricultural lands from the 1470.3 acres in 2011 to 837.45 identified in 2025. While this sounds like a promising feat toward our goals, ground truth verification, and aerial imagery analysis could not verify this drastic of a change. More information is needed to support met or unmet on acres reduced alone. Increases in acreage of intersect demand more attention towards BMP's identified in the workplan as enhancing associated critical areas. Our implementation saw significant increases in these demands to support the protection and enhancement of critical area functions and values.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

ArcGIS Pro Spatial Analysis Tools, Field GIS ground verification, LiDAR restorable canopy height analysis in WRIA 14, publicly available data analysis. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

2024 NWI wetland data differed in both type in classification from previous releases. The 2011 and 2016 NWI was raster cell with different classification categories, where the 2024 NWI data was polygon and had fewer classifications, or bundled previous classifications. Even with using USGSS soils layers for highly hydrolyzed soils to correct NWI wetland assumptions, the results was comparing apples to oranges and did not corroborate on the ground verification. Plans for future monitoring using elevation derived hydrology and intrinsic wetland potential models have been proposed. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Reduce agricultural and erosion hazard area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from erosion areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to erosion areas.

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Enhancement,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

Yes

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

122.8 Acres Erosion Hazard Area Intersect

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from Erosion Hazard Areas, reducing direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive soils. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of Erosion Hazard Area-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, water runoff management, controlled livestock access and others, helps protect Erosion Hazard Area. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve hydrologic function, and soil retention. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and critical Erosion Hazard Area interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting soil stability,

reducing sediment delivery to waterways, improving water quality, and maintaining the long-term productivity and resilience of agricultural lands.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and erosion hazard area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from erosion areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to erosion areas.

Critical Areas:

Geologically Hazardous,

WRIsAs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from Erosion Hazard Areas, reducing direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive soils. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of Erosion Hazard Area-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, water runoff management, controlled livestock access and others, helps protect Erosion Hazard Area. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve hydrologic function, and soil retention. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and critical Erosion Hazard Area interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting soil stability, reducing sediment delivery to waterways, improving water quality, and maintaining the long-term productivity and resilience of agricultural lands.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Lost -31.56 acres since 2011. This represents a -35.61% Decrease in overlap from the 1.58% acres intersect in 2011 to the 1.02% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -1.52% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 11 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 30 facility units, 36.97 acres, and 302.45 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 95 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 33 facility units, 159.95 acres, and 47259.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 76.36%, 0.89%, 33.26%, and 1552.54% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Gained 4.9 acres since 2011. This represents a -8.92% Minor Change in overlap from the 2.08% acres intersect in 2011 to the 1.9% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 2.21% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Minor Change in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 2 facility units, 2.56 acres, and 20.98 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 44 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 15 facility units, 107.53 acres, and 19880 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, 61.35%, 409.22%, and 9464.56% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Gained 61.06 acres since 2011. This represents a 111% Increase in overlap from the 2.29%

acres intersect in 2011 to the 4.84% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -2.49% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 11 facility units, 13.02 acres, and 106.52 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 58 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 13 facility units, 210.87 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, 2.18%, 151.94%, and 1145.11% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Erosion Hazard Area Gained 0.44 acres since 2011. This represents a 113.9% Increase in overlap from the 0.04% acres intersect in 2011 to the 0.08% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 0.06% minor Change in watershed wide Erosion Hazard Area this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Erosion Hazard Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas installing 7 facility units, 8.44 acres, and 69.05 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Erosion Hazard Areas totaled 3 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Erosion Hazard Areas totaling 2 facility units, 25.23 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, -7.11%, 19.89%, and 1516.52% respectively.

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

122.8

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Erosion Hazard Area Intersect

Result Metric Number

157.63

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Erosion Hazard Area Intersect

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

Brush Management (314); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Dam, Diversion (348); Dike and Levee (356); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Dam (402); Grade Stabilization Structure (410); Grassed Waterway (412); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Above Ground, Multi-Outlet Pipeline (431); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface (443); Irrigation Water Management (449); Access Control (472);

Mulching (484); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Access Road (560); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Channel Bed Stabilization (584); Structure for Water Control (587); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Early Successional Habitat Development/Management (647); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

**If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:
Accomplishment Status**

Met

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

Spatial analysis indicated a 34.83 acre increase in Erosion Hazard Area acre intersect on agricultural lands from the 122.8 acres in 2011 to 157.63 identified in 2025. A county wide 10-year change of only 35 acres does not give any confidence to deliberate changes from implementation alone. Since geographically hazardous areas are covered by existing policy backstops, and erosion hazard makes up such a small portion of county agriculture, enhancement measures take a back seat to more urgent watershed needs such as wetlands, and habitat areas, focusing on functions and values that impact water quality. Most of the erosion acres identified in the county also reside in lands covered by the shoreline management act. Adaptive management has been proposed to move focus toward more urgent watershed needs and implementation over the past ten years reflects this sentiment.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

ArcGIS Pro Spatial Analysis Tools, Field GIS ground verification, publicly available data analysis. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Spatial analysis indicated a 34.83 acre increase in Erosion Hazard Area acre intersect on agricultural lands from the 122.8 acres in 2011 to 157.63 identified in 2025. A county wide 10-year change of only 35 acres does not give any confidence to deliberate changes from implementation alone as improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods.

Choose the applicable benchmark you'll be submitting your entry for:

Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas

Choose the applicable goals for the Benchmark:

Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Indicate the applicable benchmark types:

Enhancement,

Was the benchmark met?

Met

Need Adaptive Management?

No

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

1399 acres of Fish and Wildlife priority Habitat Areas intersecting Agricultural land

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark, and how the activities protect or enhance critical area functions and values.

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas reduces direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of habitat-sensitive BMPs; such as vegetated buffers, fencing, water runoff management, critical area plantings, controlled livestock access, and others help protect habitat quality and connectivity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve riparian function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife movement corridors. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting biodiversity, improving habitat structure, protecting water quality, and sustaining the ecological integrity of working lands.

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIs:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas reduces direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of habitat-sensitive BMPs—such as vegetated buffers, fencing, water runoff management, critical area plantings, controlled livestock access, and others help protect habitat quality and connectivity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve riparian function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife movement corridors. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting biodiversity, improving habitat structure, protecting water quality, and sustaining the ecological integrity of working lands.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas Lost -452.79 acres since 2011. This represents a -45.73% Decrease in overlap from the 18.49% acres intersect in 2011 to the 10.04% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -53.66% decrease in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as

agriculture acreage intersect maintained in line with watershed critical area losses. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 2.51% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 9 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 35 facility units, 16.97 acres, and 13869.2 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 84 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 23 facility units, 276.81 acres, and 44104.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 83.33%, -3.34%, 153.1%, and 21.8% respectively. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions alongside reduction in agricultural overlap. Supplemental attachment: Table 1 Agricultural Best Management Practices Installed 3 Table 2 Acreage by WRIA of Critical Area and Agriculture 4 Table 4 WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough All practices Installed 2000-2025 6 Figure 3 Fecal Coliform by WRIA and Year 11 Figure 5 WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough Stream Temperature 14 Figure 8 Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) By WRIA and Sample Year 17 Figure 9 Turbidity By WRIA and Year 18 Figure 10 WSDA Agriculture Reported Acres over time 20 Figure 11 303d Stream Miles / Acres of Agriculture by watershed 21 Figure 12 SWIFD Stream Miles / Acres Agriculture by WRIA 22

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

895.1

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Interface

Result Metric Number

442.31

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

Waste Storage Facility (313); Brush Management (314); Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Diversion (362); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Access Control (472); Livestock Pipeline (516); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575);

Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Pest Management Conservation System (595); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Wildlife Watering Facility (648); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIsAs:

15-Kitsap,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas reduces direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of habitat-sensitive BMPs—such as vegetated buffers, fencing, water runoff management, critical area plantings, controlled livestock access, and others help protect habitat quality and connectivity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve riparian function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife movement corridors. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting biodiversity, improving habitat structure, protecting water quality, and sustaining the ecological integrity of working lands.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas Lost - 14.28 acres since 2011. This represents a -79.83% Decrease in overlap from the 6.82% acres intersect in 2011 to the 1.38% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 375.52% increase in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Decrease in interface could be interpreted as agriculture establishing outside of Critical Areas. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 7.50% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 3 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 2 facility units, 1.18 acres, and 962.17 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 63 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 14 facility units, 152.94 acres, and 19800 feet. This represents an annual average change of 200%, 48.41%, 1288.99%, and 195.79% respectively. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions alongside reduction in agricultural overlap. Supplemental attachment: Table 1 Agricultural Best Management Practices Installed 3 Table 2 Acreage by WRIA of Critical Area and Agriculture 4 Table 5 WRIA 15 - Kitsap All practices Installed 2000-2025 7 Figure 3 Fecal Coliform by WRIA and Year 11 Figure 6 WRIA 15 - Kitsap Stream Temperature 15 Figure 8 Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) By WRIA and Sample Year 17 Figure 9 Turbidity By WRIA and Year 18 Figure 10 WSDA Agriculture Reported Acres over time 20

Figure 11 303d Stream Miles / Acres of Agriculture by watershed 21 Figure 12 SWIFD Stream Miles / Acres Agriculture by WRIA 22

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

22.9

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Interface

Result Metric Number

8.6

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Waste Storage Facility (313); Brush Management (314); Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Diversion (362); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Access Control (472); Livestock Pipeline (516); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Pest Management Conservation System (595); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Wildlife Watering Facility (648); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIsAs:

16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas reduces direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of habitat-sensitive BMPs—such as vegetated buffers, fencing, water runoff management, critical area plantings, controlled livestock access, and others help protect habitat quality and connectivity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve riparian function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife movement corridors. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting biodiversity, improving habitat structure, protecting water quality, and sustaining the ecological integrity of working lands.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas Gained 310.87 acres since 2011. This represents a 35.6% Increase in overlap from the 28.22% acres intersect in 2011 to the 38.26% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a -10.75% decrease in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Increase in interface could be interpreted as agriculture encroachment. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 0.80% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 12 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 12 facility units, 5.98 acres, and 4884.48 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 88 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 13 facility units, 823.85 acres, and 12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 63.33%, 0.83%, 1368.37%, and 15.19% respectively. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions despite an increase in agricultural overlap. Supplemental attachment: Table 1 Agricultural Best Management Practices Installed 3 Table 2 Acreage by WRIA of Critical Area and Agriculture 4 Table 6 WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips All practices Installed 2000-2025 8 Figure 3 Fecal Coliform by WRIA and Year 11 Figure 7 WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips Stream Temperature 16 Figure 8 Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) By WRIA and Sample Year 17 Figure 9 Turbidity By WRIA and Year 18 Figure 10 WSDA Agriculture Reported Acres over time 20 Figure 11 303d Stream Miles / Acres of Agriculture by watershed 21 Figure 12 SWIFD Stream Miles / Acres Agriculture by WRIA 22

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

12

Target Metric Unit

BMPs

Target Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat BMP's

Result Metric Number

88

Result Metric Unit

BMP's

Result Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat BMP's

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Waste Storage Facility (313); Brush Management (314); Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Diversion (362); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Access Control (472); Livestock Pipeline (516); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Pest Management Conservation System (595); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Wildlife Watering Facility (648); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

Accomplishment Status

Met

Benchmark: Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas

Critical Areas:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

WRIAs:

22-Lower Chehalis,

Strategy:

Encouraging landowners to maintain or relocate agricultural activities away from Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas reduces direct impacts and disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Where avoidance is not possible, the use of habitat-sensitive BMPs, such as vegetated buffers, fencing, water runoff management, critical area plantings, controlled livestock access, and others help protect habitat quality and connectivity. Restoration and enhancement projects further improve riparian function, native vegetation cover, and wildlife movement corridors. Collectively, these actions reduce the agricultural and Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area interface below the 2011 baseline and enhance critical area functions and values by supporting biodiversity, improving habitat structure, protecting water quality, and sustaining the ecological integrity of working lands.

Accomplishment:

In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, the acreage of Agriculture intersecting Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas Lost 0 acres since 2011. This represents a 0% Minor Change in overlap from the 0% acres intersect in 2011 to the 0% in 2025. Monitoring data shows a 0% minor Change in watershed wide Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat Areas this Minor Change in interface could be interpreted as agriculture acreage intersect maintained. Additionally, HRCD identified change polygons from 2011-2024 make up only 1.11% of agricultural acres in the watershed. See attachments for analysis methods and additional tables referenced below. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 0 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 8 facility units, 3.87 acres, and 3166.16 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 5 unique practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 2 facility units, 29.93 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of 0%, -7.46%, 67.25%, and 23.29% respectively. Supplemental attachment: Table 1 Agricultural Best Management Practices Installed 3 Table 2 Acreage by WRIA of Critical Area and Agriculture 4 Figure 11 303d Stream Miles / Acres of Agriculture by watershed 21 Figure 12 SWIFD Stream Miles / Acres Agriculture by WRIA 22 Table 7 WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis All Practices Installed 2000-2025 9

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

0

Target Metric Unit

Acres

Target Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Interface

Result Metric Number

0

Result Metric Unit

Acres

Result Metric Item

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Interface

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Waste Storage Facility (313); Brush Management (314); Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Diversion (362); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Access Control (472); Livestock Pipeline (516); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Pest Management Conservation System (595); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614);

Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Wildlife Watering Facility (648); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

Accomplishment Status

More data required

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met. (To share adaptive management activities, please share in the Adaptive Management section.)

Spatial analysis indicated a 157 acre decrease in Fish and Wildlife priority Habitat acre intersect on agricultural lands from the 1399 acres in 2011 to 1242.8 identified in 2025. This small change over 10-years could not be verified to be intentional reduction in acreage however, Fish and Wildlife priority Habitat BMP's increased significantly across each watershed with the exception of acres installed in WRIA 14 which reduced by 3%. These trends show a change in focus on fish and wildlife centered BMP's to help support the protection and enhancement of habitat functions and values within the watershed. The benchmark of enhancement has been met, as demonstrated by a substantial increase in the number, extent, and targetedness of BMPs implemented within Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas since 2011, indicating measurable progress in protecting and enhancing critical area functions despite agricultural overlap.

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes

If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

ArcGIS Pro Spatial Analysis Tools, Field GIS ground verification, publicly available data analysis. Results in supplemental attachment: Methods Page 1 Source Tables Page 3 Fecal Coliform Page 11 Stream Temperature Page 13 Dissolved Oxygen Page 17 Turbidity Page 18 Acres Changes Page 20

How does the monitoring data support whether your benchmark has been met?

Spatial analysis indicated a 157 acre decrease in Fish and Wildlife priority Habitat acre intersect on agricultural lands from the 1399 acres in 2011 to 1242.8 identified in 2025. This small change over 10-years could not be verified to be intentional reduction in acreage however, Fish and Wildlife priority Habitat BMP's increased significantly across each watershed with the exception of acres installed in WRIA 14 which reduced by 3%. However, function and value monitoring did identify a 300-acre reduction in 200ft riparian buffer low canopy height based on 2007 to 2019 LiDAR in WRIA 14. The small decrease in WRIA 14 BMP implementation acreage could be the result of growing agriculture in other WRIA's and focusing on needs there. Improved or changing data quality but may also create inconsistencies when compared to earlier datasets. These differences can partially skew trend results and make it challenging to confidently update or adjust baseline conditions. To address this, adaptive management may be applied by considering previous reporting years as reference baselines, allowing for more accurate assessment of progress while accounting for data variability and evolving monitoring methods.

Describe the attachments you are attaching that supports your Goals and Benchmarks results:

VSP 2025 5-year report Appendices (Supplemental Attachment) is a source table, monitoring data results summary for VSP implementation and function and value effectiveness monitoring, Included are references to partner organizations, external studies, and local environmental health assessments.

Attach any supporting documents for your Goals and Benchmarks results:

• VSP 2025 5-year report appendices.pdf

Critical Area Losses (REQUIRED)

Did the monitoring data identify any critical area losses?

Yes

If yes, please provide WHAT critical area loss happened:

in 2011, 18.43% of agricultural land intersected with Wetland. In 2025, 10.24% of agricultural land intersected with Wetland. In 2011, this intersect accounted for 2.52% of all wetland acreage in the county, in 2025, this status is maintained at 2.11% intersect of all Wetland acreage. The moderate Decrease is consistent with population growth trends, and the 24% increase of agriculture in Mason County from 2011-2025, and the 32% loss in wetland acreage county wide based on 2025 publically available data results.

If yes, please provide WHY the critical area loss happened:

We are unsure the nature or accuracy of the loss reported by 2024 NWI data. When compared to 2011 and 2016 NWI, and referenced to USGS hydrolyzed soils, the 2024 NWI shows significant losses county wide that on the ground field verification, HRCD, and aerial verification could not confirm. The NWI data has both difference in data type (vector from raster) and data classifications within the attributes mixing or excluding older classification types.

Is this a Protection loss or an Enhancement loss?

Protection Loss

Select the WRIsAs that were impacted by this loss:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Select the Critical Areas of this loss:

Wetlands,

Please write in the functions or values monitored that found this loss:

Public spatial data analysis of NWI wetlands from 2011 (baseline data), 2016, and 2024 identified significant acreage losses. Functions and Values of wetlands monitored such as 200ft riparian buffer tree height, temperature, DO, fecal coliform, 303d listed waterways (Miles Intersect), and SWIFD salmon habitat (Miles Intersect) indicated no changes that reflected spatial data analysis. Additionally, ground field verification, HRCD, and aerial verification could not confirm.

Please identify how your implementation efforts have offset the reported losses:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 34 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 5 facility units, 19.7 acres, and 13566.75 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 103 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 39 facility units, 275.64 acres, and 46569.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 20.29%, 70.43%, 129.93%, and 24.33% respectively. In WRIA 15 - Kitsap, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 36 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 0 facility units, 1.37 acres, and 941.19 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 67 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 153.04 acres, and 19880 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.61%, 435.91%, 1109.86%, and 201.22% respectively. In WRIA 16 - Skokomish - Dosewallips, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 46 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 2 facility units, 6.94 acres, and 4777.96 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 86 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 15 facility units, 550.95 acres, and

12304 feet. This represents an annual average change of 8.7%, 77.84%, 784.15%, and 15.75% respectively. In WRIA 22 - Lower Chehalis, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Wetlands consisted of 7 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands installing 1 facility units, 4.5 acres, and 3097.11 feet. In the ten year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected with Wetlands totaled 5 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Wetlands totaling 2 facility units, 29.93 acres, and 10540 feet. This represents an annual average change of -2.86%, 8.07%, 56.56%, and 24.03% respectively.

If yes, please provide WHAT critical area loss happened:

Updated Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Area (FWPHA) Identified a 50% reduction (452 Acres) in FWPHA intersecting Agricultural Lands from 2011 baseline to 2025 in WRIA 14 Kennedy - Goldsborough.

If yes, please provide WHY the critical area loss happened:

Monitoring currently inconclusive to the reasoning, and is assumed to be source data differences. Source Data analysis showed a coinciding 53% reduction in FWPHA across the WRIA, despite a 6% increase in agricultural acres intersect with FWPHA. This suggests maintaining baseline intersection relationship consistent with non-agricultural intersect related losses in the watershed. Additionally, function and value indicators such as miles of 303d listed waterways, DO, Temperature, did not reflect similarly drastic changes over the reported time period, and WRIA 14 riparian forested buffer acreage showed an opposit relationship; increase in acreage of forested riparian buffer. SWIFD stream miles per acre of agriculture did however increase in WRIA 14, but maintained declining rate relative to baseline. Supplemental attachment: Figure 5 WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough Stream Temperature 14 Figure 8 Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) By WRIA and Sample Year 17 Figure 9 Turbidity By WRIA and Year 18 Table 2 Acreage by WRIA of Critical Area and Agriculture 4 Figure 11 303d Stream Miles / Acres of Agriculture by watershed 21 Figure 12 SWIFD Stream Miles / Acres Agriculture by WRIA 22

Is this a Protection loss or an Enhancement loss?

Protection Loss

Select the WRIAs that were impacted by this loss:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Select the Critical Areas of this loss:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat,

Please write in the functions or values monitored that found this loss:

Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Spatial Data (2011-2024), 303d Listed Stream Miles, temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, turbidity, acreage forested riparian buffer (200ft),

Please identify how your implementation efforts have offset the reported losses:

In WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough, 2011 benchmark goals of 10-year BMP implementation in Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas consisted of 9 counts of individual BMPs identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas installing 35 facility units, 16.97 acres, and 13869.2 feet. In the ten-year period from 2016-2025, BMP's installed on agricultural lands that intersected Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaled 84 practices identified in the workplan to protect or enhance Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Areas totaling 23 facility units, 276.81 acres, and 44104.54 feet. This represents an annual average change of 83.33%, -3.34%, 153.1%, and 21.8% respectively. Supplemental attachment: Table 4 WRIA 14 - Kennedy - Goldsborough All practices Installed 2000-2025 6 Table 1 Agricultural Best Management Practices Installed 3

Critical Area Monitoring (OPTIONAL)

Please describe the monitoring approach (e.g. Aerial imagery, NAIP) that you used:

LiDAR Canaopy height analysis caculating area of restorable (Site Potential Tree Hight > 0ft < 5ft) Riparian acres along 200ft stream buffer, Analysis Perfomed by WRIA, HUC, and Agricultural Parcel, over 600,000 Acres, as new lidar becomes available.

Please enter how many years this particular monitoring approach has been in use/used:

2

Choose the goals that were monitored using your approach above:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011; Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Choose the benchmarks that were monitored using your approach above:

Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface, Maintain baseline acreage of Interface, Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs, Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas,

Choose the applicable critical areas monitored with this approach:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas,

Choose the applicable WRIsAs monitored with this approach:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough,

Which monitoring support is this related to?

Watershed-related / Critical area functions,

Please explain your monitoring results from this approach:

Using LiDAR-derived canopy height data, we analyzed riparian areas along a 200-foot stream buffer to identify restorable forested acres—defined as areas with Site Potential Tree Height (SPTH) greater than 0 ft but less than 5 ft. This analysis was performed across multiple scales, including WRIA (Water Resource Inventory Area), HUC (Hydrologic Unit Code), and individual agricultural parcels, covering over 600,000 acres of land. Results show that 633 acres were identified for restoration on Agricultural Land in 2007, and 378 acres in 2019 remained on that same land, indicating enhanced riparian forest structure. As SPTH increases, restored trees provide shade, stabilize stream banks, and reduce sediment and nutrient runoff. Taller, denser canopy contributes to enhanced riparian buffer function, improving water quality and controlling erosion. Increased canopy height and resulting riparian forest structure support cooler stream temperatures, reduced fine sediment input, and improved habitat complexity, which are critical for salmonid spawning and rearing. In estuarine and nearshore areas, riparian vegetation reduces nutrient and sediment loads that can negatively impact shellfish beds, improving water clarity and overall estuarine health.

Please describe the monitoring approach (e.g. Aerial imagery, NAIP) that you used:

Downstream Water Quality reports for three WRIsAs (14,15,16), examining temperature, Dissolved oxygen, and fecal coliform; See Supplemental Attachment (appendices): Methods Page 1

Please enter how many years this particular monitoring approach has been in use/used:

3

Choose the goals that were monitored using your approach above:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011; Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures; Establish baseline monitoring program to measure benchmarks over a ten year period;

Choose the benchmarks that were monitored using your approach above:

Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface, Maintain BMP Implementation, 5% annual increase of BMP implementation (based on averaged annual implementation over 5 year period of each BMP through the County), Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs, Reduce agricultural and erosion hazard area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from erosion areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to erosion areas., Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas,

Choose the applicable critical areas monitored with this approach:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas,

Choose the applicable WRIAs monitored with this approach:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips,

Which monitoring support is this related to?

Watershed-related / Critical area functions,

Please explain your monitoring results from this approach:

Monitoring of monthly water quality samples in a handful of HUC-12 level reaches across three WRIAs have showed little measurable change over the monitoring period. See Supplemental Attachment (appendices): Figure 3 Fecal Coliform by WRIA and Year 11 Figure 4 Stream Temperature 13 Figure 8 Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) By WRIA and Sample Year 17 Figure 9 Turbidity By WRIA and Year 18

Please describe the monitoring approach (e.g. Aerial imagery, NAIP) that you used:

ESRI ArcGIS Pro Spatial Analysis of critical area, agriculture, 303d stream miles, SWIFD stream miles. Methods useing feature intersection and geodesic area calculation in US Survey Acres, HARN NAD83 Washington Stateplane South. See Supplemental Attachment (appendices): Methods Page 1

Please enter how many years this particular monitoring approach has been in use/used:

5

Choose the goals that were monitored using your approach above:

Protect critical area functions and values on agricultural lands at a watershed level as they existed as of July 22, 2011; Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses; Enhance critical area functions and values through voluntary, incentive-based measures;

Choose the benchmarks that were monitored using your approach above:

Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface, Maintain baseline acreage of Interface, Maintain baseline acreage of Agricultural Activity, Reduce agricultural and wetland interface to less than 2011 baseline: (1) maintain and reconfigure agricultural activities away from wetland areas; or (2) restoring and enhancing wetlands in or near agricultural activity utilizing wetland sensitive BMPs, Reduce agricultural and erosion hazard area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from erosion areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to erosion areas., Reduce agricultural and fish and wildlife conservation area interface to less than 2011 baseline by: (1) maintaining and reconfiguring agricultural activities away from habitat areas; or (2) utilizing BMPs specific to habitat areas,

Choose the applicable critical areas monitored with this approach:

Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, Geologically Hazardous Areas, Frequently Flooded Areas,

Choose the applicable WRIsAs monitored with this approach:

14-Kennedy - Goldsborough, 15-Kitsap, 16-Skokomish-Dosewallips, 22-Lower Chehalis,

Which monitoring support is this related to?

Watershed-related / Critical area functions,

Please explain your monitoring results from this approach:

Results determined acre change for each WRIA, Critical area and Agriculture. examined some indicators of critical area function and value. See Supplemental Attachment (appendices): Table 2 Acreage by WRIA of Critical Area and Agriculture 4 Table 3 Source Acreage Summaries 5 Figure 10 WSDA Agriculture Reported Acres over time 20 Figure 11 303d Stream Miles / Acres of Agriculture by watershed 21 Figure 12 SWIFD Stream Miles / Acres Agriculture by WRIA 22

Agricultural Viability

Please describe agricultural viability challenges or successes in your county:

Mason County's agricultural sector demonstrates both resilience and meaningful growth in recent years. According to the 2022 Census of Agriculture, the county had 368 farms, a 14 % increase from 2017. Total land in farms reached 36,865 acres in 2022, representing a substantial increase (approximately 103 %) since 2017. The average farm size grew to about 100 acres, up roughly 79 % from 2017. On the economic side, market value of agricultural products sold in the county was about \$83.3 million in 2022, an increase of 72 % over 2017. Net cash farm income also rose sharply (about 172 % increase) to approximately \$26.2 million. These figures signal that the county's farms are not just holding steady, but expanding in scale and market value, which bodes well for viability. That said, structural challenges remain. In 2022, only 5,065 acres of the total land in farms were classified as harvested cropland; a large portion of farm land (20,713) acres was woodland. This composition suggests that much of the agricultural land may not be in intensive row crop or high-input crop production, which can limit revenue per acre and competitive advantage. Other documented obstacles include less favorable soils or terrain for large scale agriculture and pressures from land-use conversions, given the county's growing development context. On the success side, Mason County benefits from specialty and niche markets especially in shellfish and aquaculture (noted by the county extension as a leading shellfish production area) as well as strong local institutional support for smaller scale, diversified farming, and community food systems. In sum the agricultural sector in Mason County is in a healthy upward trend more farms, more productive activity, increased sales but remains constrained by terrain, land-use competition, and a relatively low harvested crop acreage base. Sustaining and enhancing viability will likely depend on continuing to leverage niche markets, adoption of specialized production systems, and supportive policy/investment frameworks to offset structural limitations. This makes VSP incredibly important for Mason County agriculture, since timberland, and aquiculture aren't the focus of VSP, best management practices on land outside of Mason County's major economic agriculture industry,

helps to promote a resilient agricultural community in regard to downstream non-point source pollutions and critical area functions and values.

Please choose your applicable Agricultural Viability goals from the dropdown menu:

Ensure the viability of agriculture and reduce the conversion of agricultural land into other uses

Please choose your applicable Agricultural Viability benchmarks from the dropdown menu:

Maintain baseline acreage of Interface, Maintain 7.5 completed farm plans (Individual Stewardship Plans) per year, Maintain baseline acreage of Agricultural Activity, Maintain baseline acreage of Agriculture and Critical Area Interface

Describe any practices or actions taken to address the above goal(s):

The Mason VSP workplan sets a goal of baseline protection to an average of 7.5 plans per year from the 5-year average identified in 2011. County Wide, we have maintained, an exceeded this goal in the 10-year period from 2016-2025 the district and county partners maintained an annual average of 23 NRCS farm plans or Individual Stewardship plans (ISP) for a total of 234. In the 5-year period from 2021-2025 an annual average 24 plans made a 5-year total of 123. by-watershed breakdowns listed in benchmark accomplishments and in attachments referenced below. The district will continue to update the landowner tracking system to obtain accurate reporting of Farm Plans on eligible properties. Adaptive management for the 2025-2030 reporting period is being considered regarding the limitations on eligible cooperators for this metric. The reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark by maintaining and updating a comprehensive landowner database, tracking agricultural operators served, and ensuring Farm Plans are implemented on eligible properties. By continuing to develop and refine the landowner tracking system, the district improves accuracy in reporting and identifies opportunities for additional engagement. These activities protect and enhance critical area functions and values by promoting sustainable agricultural practices that reduce erosion, maintain soil health, conserve water quality, and support habitat integrity, ensuring that agricultural operations are compatible with the ecological functions of critical areas. Maintaining the baseline acreage of agriculture within the Critical Area Interface protects and enhances critical area functions and values by preventing the conversion of agricultural lands into more intensive or impervious uses that can degrade water quality, increase runoff, and fragment habitat. Sustaining agricultural use in these areas supports soil health, infiltration, and vegetative cover, which help filter pollutants and maintain hydrologic function. Continued agricultural viability also encourages stewardship and participation in voluntary conservation practices that improve riparian buffers, reduce erosion, and enhance habitat connectivity. By keeping agricultural land in production and preventing unmanaged development pressures, the County ensures long-term protection of water resources, fish and wildlife habitat, and other critical area functions. Promote annual participation in ISP checklist surveys through direct outreach, follow-up reminders, and coordination with agricultural operators. Use existing landowner databases and field visits to encourage timely survey completion. Track responses to identify trends, update records, and target technical assistance where needed to support voluntary conservation practices that protect and enhance critical area functions.

Please describe outreach activities conducted:

Regular site visits and technical assistance to local agricultural operations over 1000 VSP returnable flyers mailed out to Agricultural operators countywide. 2000 VSP survey post-cards to priority outreach areas seeking engagement from small family farms on critical areas. Promotion of VSP at multiple county annual events. Regular Social Media campaigns. Participant signage and stickers. Increasing cost share rates for VSP participants from 75% to 90%, as well as district base cost share rates from 75% to 80% for incentive for participation. Ongoing communications with County officials. Permanent outreach signage at public agricultural hot spots and business centers. Partnership with local tractor club's no-till seed drill rental program. Partnership with local tribal farm community engagement events.

What, if any, BMPs did you implement to address these goal(s) and/or benchmark(s)?

Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (100); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (102); Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan - Applied (103); Nutrient Management Plan - Written (104); Irrigation

Water Management Plan - Written (118); Waste Storage Facility (313); Composting Facility (317); Short Term Storage of Animal Waste and By-Products (318); On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility (319); Channel Bank Vegetation (322); Conservation Cover (327); Conservation Crop Rotation (328); Residue and Tillage Management, No Till (329); Cover Crop (340); Critical Area Planting (342); Roofs and Covers (367); Fence (382); Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390); Riparian Forest Buffer (391); Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395); Aquatic Organism Passage (396); Grassed Waterway (412); Wildlife Habitat Planting (420); Hedgerow Planting (422); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Above Ground, Multi-Outlet Pipeline (431); Irrigation Pipeline (430); Irrigation Water Management (449); Access Control (472); Prescribed Grazing (528); Roof Runoff Structure (558); Heavy Use Area Protection (561); Trails and Walkways (568); Trails and Walkways (575); Stream Crossing (578); Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580); Nutrient Management (590); Tree/Shrub Establishment (612); Watering Facility (614); Vegetative Barrier (635); Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645); Constructed Wetland (656); Wetland Restoration (657); Wetland Enhancement (659)

Describe the attachments you are attaching that supports your Agricultural Viability results:

USDA Agriculture Census reports for 2017 and 2022, referenced in VSP Supplemental attachment, included here.

Attach any supporting documents for your Agricultural Viability results:

- AgCensus_2017.pdf
- AgCensus_2022.pdf

Landowner Participation

Provide a summary of approaches being used in landowner outreach and technical assistance:

Mason Conservation District and county partners use a combination of outreach and technical assistance strategies to engage agricultural landowners and support voluntary stewardship efforts. The District maintains and updates a comprehensive landowner tracking system to monitor participation, Individual Stewardship Plans (ISPs), and NRCS Farm Plans on eligible properties. Interactive mapping tools and GIS-based databases are used to identify agricultural operations within critical areas, track BMP implementation, and evaluate trends over time. Direct outreach, including annual operator mailings, field visits, and follow-up surveys, ensures ongoing engagement and accurate reporting. The District also hosts stakeholder meetings, workshops, and community events to share program updates, gather feedback, and promote voluntary participation. Marketing and communication efforts, such as newsletters, web resources, and social media outreach, highlight available technical and financial assistance opportunities. Through these combined approaches, the District fosters strong relationships with producers, increases awareness of conservation practices, and ensures that technical assistance is accessible, targeted, and aligned with the goals of the Mason County VSP Work Plan. These strategies include: Regular site visits and technical assistance to local agricultural operations Over 1000 VSP returnable flyers mailed out to Agricultural operators countywide. 2000 VSP survey post-cards to priority outreach areas seeking engagement from small family farms on critical areas. Promotion of VSP at multiple county annual events. Regular Social Media campaigns. Participant signage and stickers. Increasing cost share rates for VSP participants from 75% to 90%, as well as district base cost share rates from 75% to 80% for incentive for participation. Ongoing communications with County officials. Permanent outreach signage at public agricultural hot spots and business centers. Partnership with local tractor club's no-till seed drill rental program. Partnership with local tribal farm community engagement events.

Number of outreach activities (e.g., newsletter articles, direct mailings, radio ads, tabling events, producer meetings):

8000

Are agricultural producers participating in voluntary and incentive-based measures at a level sufficient to meet the county's goals and benchmarks?

Yes

Adaptive Management

Below you can enter your Adaptive Management Goals and Benchmarks that are NOT already in your work plan.

Note: Any protection or enhancement Benchmark results are recommended to have at least 1 Accomplishment added.

Please enter your new goal (not already in your work plan):

Please enter your new benchmark (not already in your work plan):

Indicate if this is a Protection or Enhancement Benchmark:

Clearly identify how the reported implementation efforts contribute to meeting this goal and benchmark:

(NOT REQUIRED) If your work plan notes accomplishments, click on 'Add Accomplishment' to add them to this benchmark. If you don't have any accomplishments for this benchmark, scroll past the next box to answer more benchmark questions.

Benchmark:

Critical Areas:

WRIAs:

Strategy:

Accomplishment:

Below, provide your targets and results for your benchmark. Targets are what you were aiming to achieve when you started. Results are what you actually achieved.

Target Metric Number

0

Target Metric Unit

Target Metric Item

Result Metric Number

0

Result Metric Unit

Result Metric Item

Choose applicable NRCS BMP

If NRCS BMP not found, please enter your BMP in box:

Accomplishment Status

Provide a brief text explanation supporting whether the benchmark was or was not met:

How does the monitoring data support whether you have met or not met this benchmark?

Benchmark Status:

What is the 2011 baseline for this entry?

Did you use monitoring data to evaluate this benchmark?

Yes


If yes, what monitoring tools or approaches did you use?

General Documents

Provide a description for all your attachments:

Attachments (max 12 files, 20MB per file):

There is nothing attached.

 Attach file - max 12 files, 20MB per file, all file types accepted