

## **2006 State of Salmon Report**

*Post mortem observations from the weeds*

January 2006

On the premise that Monitoring Forum members will benefit from a few general observations about the 2006 State of Salmon Report, I offer the following to serve as the beginning of future discussions that will continue to improve and guide the next publication. A bit of history is also provided.

### **History**

- Legislation tasked GSRO with producing the State of Salmon Report biennially, beginning in December 2000
- December 2000 – The first State of Salmon Report was newspaper-style. It did not report on progress (too soon), did not report on indicators (hadn't developed them), and did not focus on specific areas of the state (not much to report). It did try to educate the public about ESA, set the stage for recovery plans, and manage to irritate a few legislators (salmon-friendly recipes).
- December 2002 – The next report came in three volumes. One was a very brief summary and reported high-level summaries of expenditures and recommendations on actions to address significant issues. The other two volumes contained the first “Dozen Dials;” linkages between goals, strategies, and actions mostly from a state agency perspective; and data from the salmon recovery scorecard.
- December 2004 – This was the first attempt to show a new scale (regions), use of maps to help readers visualize actions, progress in the Dozen Dials, and the first use of fish spawner numbers measured against goals from developing recovery plans, summarized habitat quality statewide using information from Limiting Factors Analyses, and introduced the idea of using indices.
- December 2006 – This model adds one more dial (for a Baker's Dozen Dials), goes to three scales for reporting (statewide, regional, and watershed), identifies questions, looks at harvest on at least an ESU scale, identifies general data gaps, and calls attention to looming threats common across the state.

### **2006 Report**

#### **Report presentation**

- Report pulled questions developed by CMS and JNRC as an organizing tool
  - Are these still the questions we want answered given our primary audiences?
- Adding information adds pages
  - Considering the primary audiences, how do you feel about the size of this report?

## **Process**

- Forum workshop established expectations about quality of information, scales, and areas the report covered
  - Do you think this helped the report?
- Meeting (or not) deadlines affects the report in various ways
- Participation of Forum committees (fish, water, implementation, passage, nearshore)

## **Improving the indicators**

- Statewide scale indicators
  - Dozen dials seem to be working well – added one this year
  - Some are getting better with information presented (water quantity most notable)
  - Expectations are clear and no real issues
- Regional scale indicators
  - Quality of indicators: some got better (harvest) some got more confusing (water quality)
  - No indexing yet
  - ESU scale harvest/escapement presented in conjunction with spawner goals is a major change and step forward; kudos to WDFW! Some issue areas, but for a first-time indicator it is remarkable
  - Remain unable to be consistent at watershed scale for some information. One watershed has great harvest data, another doesn't, e.g.
  - How can indicators be improved and what are the highest priority needs for improvement?
- Watershed scale indicators
  - Timing a problem
  - “Ownership” of watershed presents opportunities and complications
- Choice of indicators came from CMS.
  - Would the Forum like to re-examine (committees)?
- Gaps are called out this time (consumer report approach; no habitat quality index or information since last SOS)
- Loss of important information via roll-up syndrome not as evident this time because we broke info down at multiple scales
- Has state agency emphasis (inclusion of federal, tribal, local data spotty) STILL, in spite of Herculean efforts on part of committee
  - What can be done to improve this?
- What can be/should be the relationship of this report with others in the same territory (PCSRF/NOAA, CBFWA, etc.); what is the relationship of the report to monitoring reports expected via regional recovery plans?

## **Short-term recommendations (by July 2007)**

- Ask Forum committees for reports/observations on what they think should be improved for next report, and how
- Review and validate/keep/reject recovery questions and indicators
- Decide on scales

- If *Watershed Watch* sticks, pick focus watersheds and work with folks in the watershed early
- Generally evaluate report content and size implications
- Consult with regional recovery organizations

**Longer-term recommendations (by November 2007)**

- Evaluate data gaps
  - Strategy to fill them
- How can indicators be improved and what are the highest priority needs?
- Production team members and Forum committee members need your support; they need to know they will have time to participate, and that this a part of their current job
- Set production schedule EARLY and decide how much flexibility will be allowed for late material!