The Importance of Tracking Our Progress

Monitoring is the fulcrum for success in salmon recovery. It is essential for analyzing and understanding watershed health and helping set restoration priorities. The state's 2002 Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy identified the most important monitoring activities agencies should do for salmon recovery and watershed health. In addition, NOAA has produced a decision framework that clarifies the things we will need to know for delisting to occur.

As mentioned earlier in this report, recovery plans have been completed that reflect great strides in identifying structures and processes for adaptive management and monitoring that will track and report progress toward recovery goals and milestones.

CHELAN COUNTY LEAD ENTITY

> "What gets measured gets done. If you don't measure results, you can't tell success from failure... If you can't recognize failure, you can't correct it. If you can demonstrate results, you can win support."
> OSBORNE & GRAEBLER, 1993

All regional recovery plans emphasize tracking implementation of actions, trends in salmon and their viability, and habitat condition. They also commit to using that information to make mid-course corrections, called adaptive management.

As we increasingly strive to improve alignment of salmon and watershed health monitoring measures and activities —from the bottom up, top down, and across watershed, regional, and statewide scales—we have identified limitations and information gaps. These gaps are particularly noticeable at the watershed scale, where the number of watersheds and the costs of monitoring them limit our ability to have sufficient data.

Some examples are:

- No monitoring capability or information on the status and trends of salmon habitat condition or water quality in watersheds at the regional and statewide scales
- Information on juvenile and adult salmon is often not available in the same watersheds
- Estimates of the number of miles inaccessible to salmon above blockages are currently unavailable
- Harvest data are often not translatable into units and measures useful to recovery planners

The Governor's Forum on Monitoring made progress in helping coordinate and resolve technical and policy issues in support of salmon recovery monitoring and reporting at the regional and statewide scales. The Forum produced its first biennial report of activities and recommendations in April 2006. Also in 2006, the Forum coordinated an effort by state agencies to develop recommendations to the Governor and legislature for improving monitoring related to salmon recovery and watershed health.

Both sets of recommendations included:

- Initiating collaborative habitat and water quality status and trend monitoring to serve the needs of watershed, regional, and statewide interests
- Bolstering salmon abundance monitoring systematically across the state in to fill key data gaps for recovery, in alignment with proposed habitat condition monitoring
- Improving management of data

Interest in documenting our collective performance and outcomes of recovery actions will only increase as regional plans are implemented. By example, the Governor's Government Management and Accountability (GMAP) approach represents a broad effort to improve accountability of state government to citizens. Such principles will also have a key role in salmon recovery and watershed health monitoring and reporting. Working with our regional recovery partners on monitoring issues, sharing the problem and forming solutions together will be essential.

Data Gap Analysis in Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs)

WATERSHED	PRIMARY FISH POPULATION?[32]	WDFW HATCHERY[33]	HARVEST[34]	HYDRO[35]	WATER QUANTITY[36]	WATER QUALITY[37]	JUVENILE PRODUCTION[38]	BARRIERS SURVEYED[39]	MILES OF ANADROMOUS WATERS INACCESSIBLE[40]
WRIA 01	Yes	●	●	○	●	◒	◒	◒	○
WRIA 02	Yes	NA	NA	○	○	○	NA	◒	○
WRIA 03	To be determined	●	◒	◒	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 04	To be determined	●	◒	○	○	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 05	To be determined	●	●	Unknown	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 06	To be determined	NA	NA	○	○	○	NA	◒	○
WRIA 07	To be determined	●	● ◒	○	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 08	To be determined	●	◒	◒	○	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 09	To be determined	●	●	NA	○	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 10	Yes	●	● ◒	NA	○	◒	● ○	◒	○
WRIA 11	Yes	●	●	○	○	◒	○	◒	○
WRIA 12	No	●	NA	○	○	○	NA	◒	○
WRIA 13	No	●	NA	NA	○	◒	◒	◒	○
WRIA 14	No	NA	NA	NA	○	○	NA	◒	○
WRIA 15	Yes	●	NA	○	●	○	NA	◒	○
WRIA 16	Yes	●	● ◒	○	○	◒	○	◒	○
WRIA 17	Yes	●	●	Unknown	●	○	○	◒	○
WRIA 18	Yes	●	● ◒	○	●	◒	◒	◒	○
WRIA 24	Yes	◒	● ◒ ○	○	●	◒	NA	◒	○
WRIA 25	Yes	◒	◒ ◒ ○	NA	●	○	● ◒ ○	◒	○
WRIA 26	Yes	◒	● ◒ ◒ ○	◒	●	◒	● ◒ ◒ ○	◒	○

Note: Data availability may vary within a Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA), dependent on either species or river.

● Sufficient data | ◒ Some data | ◒ No sufficient data | ○ No data | NA: Not applicable

WATERSHED	PRIMARY FISH POPULATION?	WDFW HATCHERY	HARVEST	HYDRO	WATER QUANTITY	WATER QUALITY	JUVENILE PRODUCTION	BARRIERS SURVEYED	MILES OF ANADROMOUS WATERS INACCESSIBLE
WRIA 27	Yes	◒	● ◒ ◔ ○	○	●	◒	● ◒ ◔ ○	◒	○
WRIA 28	Yes	◒	● ◒ ◔ ○	NA	●	○	◔ ○	◒	○
WRIA 29	Yes	NA	◒ ◔ ○	NA	○	○	● ◔	◒	○
WRIA 32	Chinook: No	◒	◔	NA	●	◒	● ○	◒	○
	MC Steelhead: Yes								
	SR Steelhead: No								
WRIA 33	Chinook: Yes	◒	NA	NA	○	◒	●	◒	○
	MC Steelhead: Yes								
	SR Steelhead: Yes								
WRIA 35	Chinook: Yes	◒	● ◔ ○	NA	●	◒	● ◒ ○	◒	○
	MC Steelhead: Yes								
	SR Steelhead: Yes								
WRIA 37	To be determined	NA	◔	NA	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 38	To be determined	NA	◔	NA	●	○	●	◒	○
WRIA 39	To be determined	NA	◔	NA	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 44	No	NA	NA	●	○	○	NA	◒	○
WRIA 45	Yes	◒	◔	NA	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 46	Yes	NA	◔	NA	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 48	Yes	◒	◔	NA	○	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 49	Yes	◒	◔	Unknown	●	◒	●	◒	○
WRIA 50	No	NA	NA	●	○	○	NA	◒	○