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Presentation Outline

• Review the big picture
• Explain what we’ve learned
• So What? – why what we’ve learned matters
THE BIG PICTURE

Monitoring & Adaptive Management Project
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Monitoring & Adaptive Management (M&AM) Project Goal

Overall Purpose:
Create and maintain an adaptive management system for Chinook recovery by organizing local, watershed-scale monitoring and adaptive management plans to be consistent and integrated across the Puget Sound region.
Overall M&AM Program Goals

Phase 1: April 2013 – June 2014
Translate high priority aspects of existing watershed recovery chapters, not make new policy

Phase 2: July 2014 and Beyond
Fill gaps, refine priorities, and use new framework to adaptively manage Chinook salmon recovery
Approach

- Watershed Core Teams
  - >60 people trained and leading
  - 100 additional people creating products

- Supporting Efforts
  - Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT)
  - PSP Staff – ERCs, Scientists, Managers
  - Long Live the Kings Coaching Team

- EPA Funded
Regional Monitoring & Adaptive Management Approach

Consistent with
“Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation”

Identify ecosystem components

Identify key ecological attributes and indicators

Identify pressures

Document strategies, actions, & current AM processes

Set targets for desired future conditions (Phase 2)

Monitor progress and adapt management (Phase 2)
Phase 1 Products: Viability

• Viability Assessment (all watersheds):
  – Habitats & stocks present in watershed
  – Important characteristics of habitats & stocks (KEAs)
  – Prioritized status & trends indicators
  – Baseline & current data for indicators
  – Identify goals & desired future status

• Viability Assessment (desired):
  – Condition bins: poor, fair, good, very good
Examples

• Channels >50m Bankfull Width
  – KEA: Sediment delivery
  – Indicator: Substrate composition

• Chinook
  – KEA: Abundance
  – Indicator: Natural origin adult spawner abundance
Phase 1 Product: Pressures

• Pressures identification (=threats)
  – Using Puget Sound Pressures Assessment taxonomy
  – Pressures adversely affecting habitats and species
## Regional Product: Pressure ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESSURE</th>
<th>% Watersheds*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Forestry Effluents</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine shoreline infrastructure</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Levees &amp; Floodgates</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Industrial</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater shoreline infrastructure</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1 Product: Results Chains

• Document strategies and objectives
• Prioritize implementation and effectiveness indicators
• Identify gaps in logic and strategies
Results Chains Articulate Theory of Change

Determine **Intermediate Outcomes** (to connect strategy to goals)

Develop Measureable **Objectives and Indicators**

- **Objective**: By 2015, remove 13,500 feet of marine shoreline armoring in WRIA 9

- **Indicator**: linear feet of armoring removed

- **Goal**: Marine shoreline infrastructure has reduced impact

- **Goal**: Armoring is removed

- **Funding is secured**

- **Prevent new and remove shoreline armoring**
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Results Chains: Identify Gaps

- **Prevent new and remove shoreline armoring**
  - Funding is secured
  - Model code language developed
  - Better SMP adopted in all 17 jurisdictions

**Armoring is removed**

**Marine shoreline infrastructure has reduced impact**

**Goal**

Bluff Beaches
Pocket Estuaries

**Miracle Occurs**
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Monitoring & Adaptive Management Project

WHAT WE’VE LEARNED
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What We Have Learned: Ecosystem Components

• Most plans comprehensively cover the ecosystem

• Menu – Common Framework– helps with self-examination
  – Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish – no nearshore components
What We Have Learned: Goals

• All watersheds have fish goals
• Some have habitat goals & desired future status
  – Nisqually & Green/Duwamish
• Many have few/no quantitative habitat goals or desired future status
  – Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish
What We Have Learned: Viability

• Core Teams understand their systems
• Technical folks in most watersheds can articulate status & trend indicators

• Needs:
  – Subset of indicators monitored consistently across the region
  – Guidance on defining desired future conditions and goals
  – Funding
What We Have Learned: Pressures/Stressors

• Most plans comprehensively identify pressures and stressors
  – Limiting factors, etc.

• PSPA provides opportunity to ID gaps.

  Green/Duwamish examples:
  – Climate change and sea level rise
  – Recreational land use

• Few plans, if any, prioritize pressures
What We’ve Learned: Results Chains

• Gaps in logic
• Gaps in strategies

“I think you should be more explicit here in step two.”
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What We’ve Learned: Results Chains

- Gaps in logic
- Gaps in strategies
- Implementation tracking already in place
- Creating system to track effectiveness
  - Green/Duwamish example

Prevent new and remove shoreline armoring

Model code language developed

Better SMP adopted in all 17 jurisdictions

Codes are enforced

Marine shoreline infrastructure has reduced impact

Indicator: linear feet of shoreline lost
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SO WHAT?
Summary: Phase 1 Results

• Framework in each watershed creates a system that:
  – Ties monitoring results clearly to actions and goals
  – Highlights gaps in current plans and structures
  – Allows for consistent reporting and evaluation of progress

• Description of existing adaptive management system
Phase 2 Desired Results

• Complete translation, especially viability work and pressures assessment
• Develop and implement new adaptive management systems in each watershed
• Develop and implement monitoring plans
THANKS TO OUR COACHING TEAM!

Laura Blackmore, Cascadia Consulting Group
Abby Hook, Hook-Knauer
Kara Nelson, Kara Nelson Consulting
Susan O’Neil, Long Live the Kings
Robert Warren, Bonneville Environmental Foundation
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION