L.J. Sonter, N. Tomsett, D. Wu, M. Maron (2017) Biodiversity offsetting in dynamic landscapes: Influence of regulatory context and counterfactual assumptions on achievement of no net loss, *Biological Conservation*, Vol. 206: 314-319.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12852

© 2017. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/</u>

- 1 **Title:** Biodiversity offsetting in dynamic landscapes: influence of regulatory context and
- 2 counterfactual assumptions on achievement of no net loss
- 3 Authors: Sonter, L.J. 1,2 , Tomsett, N. 3,4 , Wu, D. 3 , Maron, M. 3,4 *
- 4 ^{1.} University of Vermont, Gund Institute for Ecological Economics, Burlington VT 05401, USA
- ^{2.} University of Vermont, Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources, Burlington
 VT 05401, USA
- ^{3.} The University of Queensland, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Brisbane Qld
 4072, Australia
- ^{4.} The University of Queensland, Centre for Biodiversity & Conservation Science, Brisbane Qld
 4072, Australia
- 11 *Corresponding authors
- 12

13 ABSTRACT

Biodiversity offsets are used to mitigate the residual impacts of development on 14 15 biodiversity. However, their ability to achieve no net loss is rarely evaluated, and factors leading to their success are mostly unknown. Here, we modelled the biodiversity outcomes 16 of averted loss offsetting-in terms of vegetation extent and habitat quality-in the 17 18 endangered brigalow woodlands of central Queensland, Australia. We found that biodiversity outcomes were highly sensitive to the time period used to inform counterfactual scenarios and 19 to large differences in clearing pressures among vegetation types used for offsetting. Our 20 21 results reveal major challenges for achieving no net loss of biodiversity in dynamic 22 landscapes globally. Offsetting policies must develop plausible counterfactual scenarios-a 23 difficult task in a volatile regulatory context-and allocate offsets according to spatially-24 explicit counterfactual biodiversity losses and gains. Failing to do so may drastically 25 overestimate the expected outcomes of offsets and thus result in large net biodiversity losses.

26 Key-words: averted loss; brigalow; biodiversity offsets; mitigation; land clearing; regrowth.

28 1. INTRODUCTION

Biodiversity offsets aim to achieve no net loss of biodiversity by counterbalancing 29 30 residual biodiversity loss from development with equivalent gains at an offset location (ten Kate et al. 2004). While their use is increasing globally (Maron et al. 2016), detailed 31 evaluations of offset policies remain few. Indeed, in most cases, their outcomes will only be 32 evident after several decades (Maron et al. 2012; Gibbons et al. 2015), limiting our ability to 33 34 assess directly whether no net loss is being achieved. Thus, ex-ante evaluation of alternative offsetting approaches is crucial for pinpointing how offset scheme design influences 35 36 biodiversity outcomes and achievement of no net loss (Sonter et al. 2014).

37 Almost all existing offset policies involve some component of averted loss (Gibbons & Lindenmayer 2007; Maron et al. 2015). This involves generating biodiversity 'gains' by 38 39 protecting and/or maintaining biodiversity that would otherwise have deteriorated in condition or 40 been lost, for example, due to deforestation or other pressures (that would not themselves trigger 41 offset requirements; (Gibbons & Lindenmayer 2007; Maron et al. 2013)). To determine 42 the biodiversity gains such protection and maintenance generates, the 'with protection' outcome must be compared to a counterfactual scenario-i.e. what would be expected to occur in 43 44 absence of development and offsetting (Maron et al. 2013; Bull et al. 2014). Such counterfactual scenarios, although never observed directly, strongly influence the biodiversity 45 outcomes from offset exchanges (Maron et al. 2015). 46

47 Despite their fundamental importance to achieving no net loss, counterfactual scenarios are often
48 neglected in decision-making and rarely explicitly stated (Maron et al. 2015; Maron et al. 2012).

49 Nevertheless, all offset decisions imply a counterfactual, the nature of which can be inferred 50 post-hoc. Both implicit and explicitly-stated counterfactuals used to calculate equivalence in 51 offset schemes tend to assume that the 'background' rate of biodiversity change – that is, without 52 the impacts and offsets – is one of biodiversity decline. This assumption may often be 53 invalid, meaning that offsets do not avert enough loss, and thus enable ongoing biodiversity 54 decline (Gordon et al. 2015; Maron et al. 2015).

55 Often, the assumed counterfactual trajectory of biodiversity loss is implausibly steep, meaning 56 that the expected biodiversity gains from offsetting are unrealistically large (Maron et al. 2015). 57 In some cases, trajectories of net biodiversity gain may be more realistic. For 58 example, landscapes with regrowing native vegetation (sensu Guariguata & Ostertag 2001) 59 may gain biodiversity, both in terms of vegetation extent and habitat quality (Bowen et 60 al. 2007). Nevertheless, even in such naturally recovering ecosystems, biodiversity loss tends 61 to occur in some places, so opportunities to avert loss probably still exist. In these cases, 62 spatially-explicit counterfactual scenarios that account for heterogeneous biodiversity 63 losses and gains are required, if averted loss offsetting is to be possible at all.

64 Because counterfactual scenarios are best-guess descriptions of future biodiversity trends, 65 plausible counterfactuals must also account for their surrounding regulatory context— 66 including both biodiversity management policies and offsetting requirements (Githiru et al. 2015; 67 Maron et al. 2016). For example, different ecosystems may be legally protected to various 68 degrees, which in turn affects biodiversity gains achieved through conserving a site as an offset. 69 As such, a one-hectare offset can yield widely different biodiversity gains depending on 70 where it is, what ecosystem it contains, and the set of regulations that apply to it. For example, in Brazil's

Quadrilátero Ferrífero mining region, allocating offsets to highly threatened ecosystems would
likely avert nine times more biodiversity loss than allocating the same area of offsets to
ecosystems deemed biologically equivalent to those damaged by development (Sonter et al.
2014).

75 Such regulatory context is also often dynamic over time. For example, in Queensland, Australia, 76 changes in land clearing regulations over the past decade and a half have altered the degree to which remnant vegetation and certain types of regrowth are protected from being cleared. As 77 78 a consequence, land clearing declined dramatically from 2003 to historically low levels in 79 2009, followed by resurgence during 2012–2014 (DSITI 2015). In such a volatile 80 regulatory environment, selecting appropriate counterfactuals is likely to be fraught. 81 Understanding the sensitivity of offset outcomes to the regulatory context and 82 accompanying policy settings is important for developing robust offset approaches that 83 effectively achieve desired outcomes (Gordon et al. 2015).

84 In this study, we modelled expected biodiversity outcomes of averted loss offsetting in a 85 dynamic ecosystem—the endangered brigalow (Acacia harpophylla) woodlands of central Queensland, Australia. This ecosystem underwent huge regulatory change over the 86 87 past two decades, affecting vegetation clearing rates. It also has the capacity to recover 88 following disturbance, resulting in natural biodiversity gains. Therefore, we used data on 89 clearing rates to simulate offsets and their biodiversity gains-in terms of vegetation extent and 90 habitat quality—under different counterfactual and offsetting assumptions. Our results reveal 91 major implications for achieving no net loss of biodiversity in dynamic landscapes.

92 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

93 **2.1. Study region**

94 Our study region is defined by the northern extent of pre-clearing brigalow woodlands (Fig. 1; SI 95 Table 1). This ecosystem has been extensively cleared over the past century (Seabrook et al. 96 2006) and continues to face pressures from multiple competing land uses. They also are 97 characterised by a capacity to regrow following disturbance (Butler 2007), where habitat 98 structural complexity and species richness of birds improve with regrowth age (Scanlan 1991; 99 Johnson 1997; Bowen et al. 2009), until 30 years post-disturbance when the richness and 100 structure of regrowth resembles those of remnant woodland. Remnant brigalow is currently 101 protected under state and federal legislation (Queensland Government 1999; DSEWPC 2008); 102 however, clearing for extractive projects is still permitted. Recently-approved projects in our 103 study region fall within the Abbot Point and Galilee Basin State Development Areas (DDIP 104 2014) (Fig. 1). These projects will require some form of offsetting under state and federal 105 policies (Commonwealth of Australia 2012; Queensland Government 2014) and thus these areas 106 were used as our case study development.

107 2.2. Modelling counterfactual scenarios

We developed a spatially-explicit land cover change model to simulate future vegetation change,
using the modelling platform Dinamica EGO (Soares-Filho et al. 2013). Model calibration
required information on historic vegetation change and explanatory landscape attributes.

We mapped land cover (remnant vegetation, regrowth, cleared land) in years 2006, 2009, 2011 at
100 m resolution. Remnant vegetation was identified from Regional Ecosystem databases

(Queensland Herbarium 2015). Regrowth was distinguished from cleared land using annually derived foliage projective cover (FPC) (DSITI 2015) and a FPC threshold of 12% (Lucas et al. 2006). Land cover maps were overlaid to quantify vegetation change (Table 1) during two time periods (2006–2009, 2009–2011). We used annual regrowth clearing maps (DSITI 2015) to correct areas we incorrectly detected to transition from regrowth to cleared land. Resultant clearing rates were similar to those reported by government agencies (DSITI 2015).

119 The Weights of Evidence method (Bonham-Carter 1994) was used to establish conditional 120 probabilities of future vegetation change, based on the spatial distribution of 2006-2009 121 vegetation change and explanatory landscape attributes. Landscape attributes included elevation, 122 soil type, protected areas, distance to roads, distance to watercourses, and distance to 123 existing land cover categories (SI Table 2). To validate the model, we simulated annual 124 vegetation change from 2009 to 2011 and compared simulated with observed vegetation 125 change, using the reciprocal comparison metric (Soares-Filho et al. 2013). Accuracy was 30% 126 at 10 ha resolution (SI Fig. 1).

The model was used to simulate future counterfactual vegetation change between years 2011 and 2040. Annual vegetation clearing rates were set to those observed between 2006 and 2011 (Table 1). We used this time period to avoid influence of different regulatory settings prior to 2006, when broad-scale vegetation clearing was not prohibited (Queensland Government 1999). However, transition rates also differed between 2006–2009 and 2009–2011, so we simulated and compared counterfactual scenarios for each time period. Since FPC is sensitive to seasonal and inter-annual factors, we fixed annual regrowth rates at regrowth clearing rates (Table 1). This did

not influence our results, as our primary question related to averted loss of existing vegetation(remnant and regrowth), not locations in which regrowth appeared through time.

136

2.3. Simulating offsets and quantifying biodiversity outcomes

137 We quantified vegetation clearing by development by overlaying land cover maps (Fig. 1; DDIP 138 2014). We assumed that, in accordance with the Queensland government's offsets policy, four 139 hectares were protected for each hectare cleared (Queensland Government 2014), and we 140 spatially allocated these offsets (using a second model developed in Dinamica EGO; Sonter et al. 141 2014) to reflect two scenarios: (1) offsets protect remnant vegetation ("remnant offsets"), and (2) 142 offsets protect regrowth ("regrowth offsets"). To mimic likely decisions about offset location and 143 size, we allocated half the offsets adjacent to existing protected areas at a minimum size of 25 ha. 144 The remainder were allocated elsewhere as new patches, of greater than 50 ha.

145 We quantified and compared biodiversity outcomes—in terms of vegetation extent and habitat 146 quality—for the four combinations of counterfactual (2006–2009 vs. 2009–2011 clearing rates) 147 and offsetting (regrowth vs. remnant offsets) scenarios. For vegetation extent, we quantified 148 averted loss as the area of counterfactual vegetation lost (ha) that occurred within the boundary 149 of offset areas. We also quantified the proportion of this averted loss that, under the 150 counterfactual scenario, naturally regrew, and the proportion of this that was re-cleared. To 151 explore the gains achieved by averted loss offsets in terms of habitat quality, we used existing 152 data for one taxon of conservation importance in the region: woodland-dependent birds. We 153 multiplied vegetation extent values by mean woodland-dependent bird species richness for each 154 of three, 15-year regrowth age categories, based on research in a nearby region in the same habitat type (ha x richness; Table 1; Bowen et al. 2009). We assumed regrowth offsets would
reflect a similar proportion of each of the regrowth age classes as recorded by Bowen et al.
(2009), and that regrowth offsets would continue to mature following protection.

Biodiversity gains of offsets accrue gradually over time, whereas the losses due to development were assumed to occur in 2011. To account for these time-lags, we adjusted all reported biodiversity outcomes using the standard time discounting approach of the Australian EPBC Act for Endangered ecological communities (discount rate of 1.2% p.a.; Miller et al. 2015). Nondiscounted biodiversity outcomes are shown in SI Fig. 2.

163 **3. RESULTS**

Vegetation clearing rates more than doubled between 2006–2009 and 2009–2011 (Table 2). Remnant clearing increased from 356 to 3076 ha yr⁻¹ and regrowth clearing increased from 1297 to 3055 ha yr⁻¹. Clearing rates also differed between vegetation types (Table 2). Regrowth clearing was nine times greater than remnant clearing during 2006–2009; while remnant clearing was greater than regrowth clearing during 2009–2011. Projecting counterfactual vegetation change to 2040 caused a decline in remnant vegetation by 9,850 ha under 2006–2009 clearing rates, and by 76,930 ha under 2009–2011 rates.

Proposed development was estimated to clear 1,480 ha of remnant vegetation and 1,460 ha of regrowth, requiring 11,760 ha of offsets under current policy. No net loss of biodiversity was not achieved under any combination of counterfactual or offsetting scenario, but the level of averted loss differed markedly among scenarios (Fig. 2). Using 2009–2011 clearing rates to inform the counterfactual scenario and allocating offsets to remnant vegetation averted 997 ha of clearing by 2025 and 2,098 ha by 2040 (representing 71% of that required to achieve no net loss). Using
equivalent clearing rates, but allocating offsets to regrowth, reduced averted loss to 863 ha by
2025 and 1,567 ha by 2040. Using 2006–2009 clearing rates further decreased averted loss by
remnant offsets to 198 ha and by regrowth offsets to 898 ha by 2040.

180 Compared to vegetation extent, biodiversity outcomes in terms of habitat quality for
181 woodland birds increased averted loss across all scenarios by 2040 (Fig. 2); however, accounting
182 for these additional biodiversity gains did not result in any scenario achieving no net loss of biodiversity.

183

Accounting for counterfactual regrowth greatly reduced biodiversity gains across all scenarios (Fig. 2). Most notably, averted loss by remnant offsets decreased from 2,098 ha to 558 ha (from 71% to 19% of that required to achieve no net loss) by 2040, once the potential for regrowth to occur following counterfactual clearing was factored in. Accounting for this counterfactual regrowth also altered relative differences in biodiversity gain among scenarios (Fig. 2). For example, averted loss by regrowth offsets became greater when using 2006–2009 transition rates (806 ha by 2040) than 2009–2011 transition rates (367 ha by 2040).

190

4. **DISCUSSION**

191

192 No-net-loss of biodiversity was not achieved under any combination of counterfactual and 193 offsetting scenarios that we considered. However, biodiversity outcomes were highly sensitive to 194 the time period used to inform counterfactual scenarios and to differences in clearing pressures 195 among vegetation types used for offsetting. Our results illustrate major challenges for developing 196 plausible counterfactual scenarios and quantifying averted loss potential in dynamic landscapes.

196 4.1. Sensitivity to counterfactual vegetation clearing

197 We used data on vegetation clearing rates from two recent time periods to inform counterfactual 198 scenarios, and found biodiversity outcomes differed under each. Clearing rates were higher 199 during 2009–2011 than 2006–2009 (Table 2) and thus averted loss by offsets was greater when 200 using 2009–2011 counterfactual clearing rates (Fig. 2). Specifically, averted loss by remnant 201 offsets was 10.6 times greater, and that by regrowth offsets was 1.7 times greater. Designing 202 plausible counterfactual scenarios is essential to reasonably predict averted loss-using 203 unreasonably high clearing rates may drastically overestimate outcomes-however, this task is 204 difficult and fraught with uncertainty.

205 Regulatory volatility is a key driver of fluctuations in vegetation clearing rates. Queensland has 206 seen several changes in government over the past six years, which has led to substantial swings 207 in vegetation regulation (Evans 2016). This creates enormous uncertainty regarding the future of 208 vegetation in the state, and renders any counterfactual scenario for offsetting almost meaningless. 209 The use of longer-term historical data is similarly fraught, as prior to 2006, Queensland 210 experienced some of the highest land clearing rates in the world; a return to such extreme loss 211 seems implausible. Such uncertainty in counterfactual scenarios plagues most offset decisions, 212 whether explicitly recognised (e.g. Sonter et al. 2014; Virah-Sawmy et al. 2014) or not.

We found biodiversity outcomes were also influenced by differences in clearing pressures among vegetation types used for offsetting. During 2006–2009, regrowth clearing was 3.6 times greater than remnant clearing (Table 1), thus regrowth offsets averted 4.5 times more loss than remnant offsets (Fig. 2). However, using 2009–2011 clearing rates, this finding reversed. Remnant Sonter, et al. (2017) "Biodiversity offsetting in dynamic landscapes: influence of regulatory context and counterfactual assumptions on achievement of no net loss", *Biological Conservation*, vol. 206, p. 314-319. DOI: <u>10.1016/j.biocon.2016.11.025</u>

clearing was greater than regrowth clearing, and thus remnant offsets averted 1.3 times more loss than regrowth offsets. Historically, regrowth clearing has surpassed remnant clearing because young regrowth had limited legal protection (Neldner 2006); however, high-value regrowth was protected between 2008 and 2013, causing a relative shift in clearing pressures. That protection was removed in 2013, but another change of government has led to proposals to reinstate it. Such changes in clearing pressures among vegetation types can drastically shift offsetting priorities.

223 Such temporal changes in vegetation clearing had considerable influence on biodiversity 224 outcomes. This was most pronounced for remnant offsets, as illustrated by their averted loss being 2.4 times greater during the second 15 years of simulation (2026–2040; 129 ha) than the 225 226 first (2011-2025; 69 ha), using 2006-2009 clearing rates (Fig. 2). We found that remnant 227 vegetation protected as offsets became increasingly threatened in the counterfactual scenario, due 228 to three interrelated factors: we allocated 50% of offsets adjacent to protected areas, remnant 229 clearing occurred preferentially near regrowth, and regrowth increased within protected areas (SI 230 Table 2). As a result, averted loss by remnant offsets increased over time. While difficult to 231 predict, such changes in spatially-explicit clearing pressures affect the rate of biodiversity gains.

232

4.2. Considering counterfactual habitat quality improvements

In comparison to vegetation extent, the biodiversity gains from offsets were improved when considering habitat quality for woodland birds, with mean species richness as a proxy (Fig. 2). For example, averted loss by regrowth offsets increased from 53% to 63%, using 2009–2011 clearing rates. Additional biodiversity gains achieved via habitat improvements could be further increased by prioritising offsets to younger regrowth, since it is not protected under legislation and have greater potential for biodiversity gains as it ages. However, biodiversity outcomes of such prioritisation are also riskier, considering recovery uncertainties associated with young regrowth (Maron et al. 2012) and the likely divergent responses of other taxa to regrowth age. In addition, while Brigalow regrowth takes 30 years to return to remnant habitat structure and bird species richness, other ecosystems may take longer and many may never naturally return to their pre-clearing biodiversity levels. In these cases, averted loss offsetting will be much more limited in its ability to achieve biodiversity gains via habitat quality improvements.

245 **4.3.** Accounting for counterfactual regrowth and re-clearing

Our results revealed two additional challenges for quantifying biodiversity outcomes in dynamic landscapes that experience both biodiversity losses and gains. First, we found that accounting for counterfactual regrowth greatly influenced biodiversity outcomes. This effect was most notable for remnant offsets, where averted loss was reduced from 71% to 19% of that required to achieve no net loss by 2040 (Fig. 2). Regrowth is rarely considered in counterfactual scenarios. However, averted loss must be additional, and so if cleared land regrows, averted loss calculations must be adjusted accordingly.

Second, some counterfactual regrowth was re-cleared by 2040. For example, 25% of the loss averted by regrowth offsets (after adjusting for regrowth) transitioned from cleared land, to regrowth, to cleared at least once, using 2009–2011 clearing rates. This dynamic explains why regrowth offsets averted more loss during the first 15 years of simulation (2011–2025) than the second (2025–2040) (Fig. 2) and illustrates potential for double counting when quantifying averted loss. Our method assessed vegetation clearing iteratively (on an annual basis), and this only counted averted loss at the first time it occurred. However, quantifying all averted loss
through time, regardless of previous clearing, would have incorrectly overestimated biodiversity
outcomes.

262 **4.4. Implications for offset policies**

263 Biodiversity offset policies must explicitly define plausible counterfactual scenarios, rather than 264 use arbitrary mitigation ratios, if they are to genuinely achieve their no net loss objectives. Such 265 counterfactuals should account for spatially-explicit biodiversity losses and gains (e.g. vegetation 266 clearing and regrowth), and capture differences among vegetation types. Although a difficult and 267 uncertain task in dynamic landscapes governed by volatile clearing policies, our results show that 268 assuming unrealistically high clearing rates and ignoring counterfactual regrowth drastically overestimates expected biodiversity gains from averted loss offsets, and results in large net 269 270 biodiversity losses.

271 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 272 M.M. is supported by Australian Research Council Future Fellowship FT140100516 and the
- 273 National Environmental Science Program's Threatened Species Recovery Hub. L.J.S received
- support from L.J.S. and K.B.W. are supported by USDA McIntire-Stennis award #2014-32100-
- 275 06050 to the University of Vermont.

277 **REFERENCES**

- Bonham-Carter, G. (1994) Geographic information systems for geoscientists: modelling withGIS. Elsevier, New York.
- 280 Bowen, M.E., McAlpine, C.A., House, A.P.N. & Smith, G.C. (2007) Regrowth forests on
- abandoned agricultural land: A review of their habitat values for recovering forest fauna.
- 282 Biological Consestvation, 140, 273-296.
- Bowen, M.E., McAlpine, C.A., Seabrook, L.M., House, A.P.N. & Smith, G.C. (2009) The age
- and amount of regrowth forest in fragmented brigalow landscapes are both important
- for woodland dependent birds. *Biological Consestvation*, **142**, 3051-3059.
- Bull, J. W., Gordon, A., Law, E. A., Suttle, K. B., & Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2014). Importance of
- 287 Baseline Specification in Evaluating Conservation Interventions and Achieving No Net Loss of
- 288 Biodiversity. *Conservation Biology*, **28**(3), 799-809.
- 289 Butler, D.W. (2007) Recovery plan for the "Brigalow (Acacia harpophylla) dominant and co-
- 290 dominant" endangered ecological community. Queensland National Parks and Wildlife
- 291 Service, Brisbane, Australia.
- 292 Commonwealth of Australia. (2012) EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy.
- 293 Australian Government, Department of Sustainability, Environmental, Water, Population and
- 294 Communities, Canberra.
- 295 DDIP. (2014) State Development Areas Queensland. Queensland Government, Department of
- 296 Development, Infrastructure and Planning (DDIP), Brisbane.

- 297 DSEWPC. (2008) EPBC Act List of Threatened Ecological Communities. Australian
 298 Government, Department of Sustainability, Environmental, Water, Population and Communities
 299 (DSEWPC), Canberra.
- 300 DSITI. (2015) Land cover change in Queensland: a Statewide Landcover and Trees Study
 301 (SLATS) report. Queensland Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation,
 302 Brisbane.
- 303 Evans, M.C. (2016) Deforestation in Australia: drivers, trends and policy responses. Pacific
 304 *Conservation Biology*, 22, 130-150.
- 305 Gibbons, P., Evans, M.C., Maron, M., Gordon, A., Le Roux, D., von Hase, A., Lindenmayer,
- 306 D.B. et al. (2015) A loss-gain calculator for biodiversity offsets and the circumstances in which
 307 no net loss is feasible. *Conservation Letters*, doi: 10.1111/conl.12206.
- 308 Gibbons, P. & Lindenmayer, D.B. (2007) Offsets for land clearing: No net loss or the tail
 309 wagging the dog? *Ecological Management & Restoration*, 8, 26-31.
- 310 Githiru, M., King, M.W., Bauche, P., Simon, C., Boles, J., Rindt, C. & Victurine, R. (2015)
- Should biodiversity offsets help finance underfunded Protected Areas? *Biological Consestvation*, **191**, 819-826.
- 313 Gordon, A., Bull, J.W., Wilcox, C. & Maron, M. (2015) Perverse incentives risk undermining
- biodiversity offset policies. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **52**, 532-537.
- Guariguata, M.R. & Ostertag, R. (2001) Neotropical secondary forest succession: changes in
 structural and functional characteristics. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 148, 185-206.
- 317 Johnson, R. (1997) The impact of clearing on brigalow communities and consequences for
- 318 conservation. pp. 359-363 in P. Hale, D. Lamb. editors. Conservation outside nature reserves.
- 319 The University of Queensland, Brisbane.

- 320 Lucas, R.M., Cronin, N., Moghaddam, M., Lee, A., Armston, J., Bunting, P. & Witte, C. (2006)
- 321 Integration of radar and Landsat-derived foliage projected cover for woody regrowth mapping,

322 Queensland, Australia. *Remote Sensing of the Environment*, **100**, 388-406.

- 323 Maron, M., Bull, J.W., Evans, M.C. & Gordon, A. (2015) Locking in loss: Baselines of decline
- in Australian biodiversity offset policies. *Biological Conservation*, **192**, 504–512.
- 325 Maron, M., Gordon, A., Mackey, B., Possingham, H. & Watson, J.E. (2016) Interactions
- 326 between biodiversity offsets and protected area commitments: avoiding perverse outcomes.
- 327 *Conservation Letters*, doi: 10.1111/conl.12222.
- 328 Maron, M., Hobbs, R.J., Moilanen, A., Matthews, J.W., Christie, K., Gardner, T.A., Keith, D.A.
- 329 et al. (2012) Faustian bargains? Restoration realities in the context of biodiversity offset
- 330 policies. *Biological Conservation*, **155**, 141-148.
- 331 Maron, M., Ives, C.D., Kujala, H., Bull, J.W., Maseyk, F., Bekessy, S.A., Gordon, A. et
- 332 al. (2016) Taming a Wicked Problem: Resolving Controversies in Biodiversity
- 333 Offsetting. *BioScience*, doi: 10.1093/biosci/biw1038.
- 334 Maron, M., Rhodes, J.R. & Gibbons, P. (2013) Calculating the benefit of conservation actions.
- 335 *Conservation Letters*, **6**, 359-367.
- 336 Miller, K.L., Trezise, J.A., Kraus, S., Dripps, K., Evans, M.C., Gibbons, P., Possingham, H.P. et
- al. (2015) The development of the Australian environmental offsets policy: from theory to
- 338 practice. *Environmental Conservation*, **42**, 306-314.
- 339 Neldner, J. (2006) Why is vegetation condition important to government? A case study from
- 340 Queensland. *Ecological Management & Restoration*, **7**, S5-S7.
- 341 Queensland Government. (1999) Vegetation Management Act, Brisbane.
- 342 Queensland Government. (2014) Environmental Offsets Policy, Brisbane.

- 343 Queensland Herbarium. (2015) Regional Ecosystem Description Database (REDD). Version 9.0.
- 344 Queensland Government, Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation345 (DSITI), Brisbane.
- 346 Scanlan, J. (1991) Woody overstorey and herbaceous understorey biomass in Acacia harpophylla
- 347 (brigalow) woodlands. *Australian Journal of Ecology*, **16**, 521-529.
- 348 Seabrook, L., McAlpine, C. & Fensham, R. (2006) Cattle, crops and clearing: Regional drivers
- 349 of landscape change in the Brigalow Belt, Queensland, Australia, 1840–2004. Landscape and
- 350 *Urban Planning*, **78**, 373-385.
- Soares-Filho, B., Rodrigues, H. & Follador, M. (2013) A hybrid analytical-heuristic method for
 calibrating land-use change models. *Environmental Modelling Software*, 43, 80-87.
- Sonter, L.J., Barrett, D.J. & Soares-Filho, B.S. (2014) Offsetting the impacts of mining to
 achieve no net loss of native vegetation. *Conservation Biology*, 28, 1068-1076.
- ten Kate, K., Bishop, J. & Bayon, R. (2004) Biodiversity offsets: views, experience and the
- 356 business case. IUCN, Insight Investment, Gland, Switzerland.
- 357 Virah-Sawmy, M., Ebeling, J. & Taplin, R. (2014) Mining and biodiversity offsets: A transparent
- and science-based approach to measure "no-net-loss". Journal Environmental Management, 143,

359 61-70.

360 FIGURES



Figure 1: Study region (grey shading), showing location of protected areas, Abbot Point and
Galilee Basin State Development Areas (DDIP 2014), and mapped remnant, regrowth and
cleared brigalow woodland in 2011. Inset shows study region within Queensland, Australia.





375 TABLES

- **Table 1:** Age class classification and habitat quality traits for brigalow woodlands. Adapted from
- 377 Bowen et al. (2009).

Classification	Vegetation age	Percentage of regrowth	Woodland bird species	
	(years)		richness (bird/ha ± SD)	
Regrowth				
Young	0-15	30.5	3.0 ± 2.4	
Intermediate	15-30	18.3	4.6 ± 2.6	
Old	30-100	51.2	10.3 ± 4.0	
Remnant	100+	n/a	9.9 ± 4.2	

Transitions	2006–2009		2009–2011	
	ha	%	ha	%
Remnant to Regrowth	210	0.07	1796	0.58
Remnant to Cleared	146	0.05	1280	0.42
Regrowth to Cleared	1297	0.41	3055	0.73
Cleared to Regrowth*	1297	0.06	3055	0.16

379 Table 2: Observed annual land cover transition rates. Table shows transition rates as absolute380 areas (ha) and percent of initial land use that transitioned during the time period.

381 *Shows corrected cleared to regrowth rates when assuming the absolute area of cleared to

382 regrowth equals that of regrowth to cleared.