VSP 5 Year Report for Okanogan County

Report Period Ending: 12/28/2020

Submitter Name	Amy
Submitter Phone	509-422-0855
Submitter Email	amy@okanogancd.org

Has the county work group approved the content and submittal of this report? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Date of Approval

PROTECTION Goals

☑ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years.

☐ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years.

ENHANCEMENT Goals

☑ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years.

☐ The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years.

Strategies and Performance Metrics, Benchmark Results and Monitoring

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
48 - Methow

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	69.1 acres of soil management practices were installed and documented in the Methow WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded. Please review the supplement submitted with this 5-Year Report for a brief introduction and a summary table of all practice implementation and benchmarks.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	262.5 acres of water management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark is 135 acres	Exceeded

	and less than one unit.	
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	90.9 acres of acres of nutrient management practices were documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1.4 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	3,435.3 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet (feet of Access Road metric was not met).	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	465.25 acres, 0.63 miles and 24 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three culverts were improved for fish passage.	Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments

The protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits (Okanogan County VSP Work Plan, pg 117).

To address the adaptive management for the 'Access Road' metric without repetitive entries in this report template, this entry will be the only one marked as "No" for the question 'Benchmark Met?' regarding the 'Access Road'. Benchmarks were established County-wide, and are the same for all critical areas and WRIAs.

Adaptive Management?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Re-evaluate 'Access Road' as a metric for its value as a Key Stewardship Practice and protection metric. If the metric is maintained, collect implementation data via stewardship checklists.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**48 - Methow**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	69.1 acres of soil management practices were installed and documented in the Methow WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	262.5 acres of water management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark is 135 acres and less than one unit.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	90.9 acres of acres of nutrient management practices were documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1.4 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	3,435.3 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	465.25 acres, 0.63 miles and 24 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three culverts were improved for fish passage.	Exceeded

---

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met. Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural	☐ Yes ☑ No

resource benefits.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded
48 - Methow

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	69.1 acres of soil management practices were installed and documented in the Methow WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	262.5 acres of water management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark is 135 acres and less than one unit.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	90.9 acres of acres of nutrient management practices were documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1.4 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	3,435.3 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	465.25 acres, 0.63 miles and 24 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three culverts were improved for fish passage.	Exceeded

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met. Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Geologic Hazard

48 - Methow

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	All protection metrics an measures reported in previous sections for the Methow WRIA apply to protect geologically hazardous areas.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	48 - Methow

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices.	69.1 acres of soil management practices were installed and documented in the Methow WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices.	262.5 acres of water management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark is 135 acres and less than one unit.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices.	90.9 acres of acres of nutrient management practices were documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres and <1 unit.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices.	1.4 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices.	3,435.3 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices.	465.25 acres, 0.63 miles and 24 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three culverts were improved for fish passage.	Exceeded

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met. Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.	☐ Yes ☑ No Re-evaluate 'Access Road' as a metric for its value as a Key Stewardship Practice and protection metric.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	484.4 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Okanogan WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1,123 acres of water management practices and 12 pump upgrades were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark of 135 acres and less than one unit was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	942 acres of nutrient management practices and one animal mortality facility was documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	2,595.5 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	41,400 acres, 29 units and 0 feet of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	662 acres, 2.4 miles and 511 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three fish passage barriers were corrected.	Exceeded

---

Benchmark Met?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.
This entry will be the only one marked as "No" for the question 'Benchmark Met?' to reduce repetitiveness in

Adaptive Management?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Re-evaluate 'Access Road' as a metric for its value as a Key Stewardship Practice and protection metric. If the metric is maintained, collect implementation data via stewardship checklists. The metric applies to all agricultural lands in the County.

this report. The Adaptive Management related to the Access Road metric is the same for all critical areas and WRIAs.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	484.4 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Okanogan WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1,123 acres of water management practices and 12 pump upgrades were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark of 135 acres and less than one unit was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	942 acres of nutrient management practices and one animal mortality facility was documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	2,595.5 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	41,400 acres, 29 units and 0 feet of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	662 acres, 2.4 miles and 511 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three fish passage barriers were corrected.	Exceeded

Benchmark Met?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments
The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded

49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	942 acres of nutrient management practices and one animal mortality facility was documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	484.4 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Okanogan WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1,123 acres of water management practices and 12 pump upgrades were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark of 135 acres and less than one unit was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	2,595.5 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	41,400 acres, 29 units and 0 feet of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The County benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	662 acres, 2.4 miles and 511 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three fish passage barriers were corrected.	Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	484.4 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Okanogan WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1,123 acres of water management practices and 12 pump upgrades were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark of 135 acres and less than one unit was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	942 acres of nutrient management practices and one animal mortality facility was documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	2,595.5 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	41,400 acres, 29 units and 0 feet of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	662 acres, 2.4 miles and 511 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three fish passage barriers were corrected.	Exceeded

---

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met. Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural	☐ Yes ☑ No

resource benefits.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	484.4 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Okanogan WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	1,123 acres of water management practices and 12 pump upgrades were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,386 acres and 13 units. The county benchmark of 135 acres and less than one unit was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for nutrient management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	942 acres of nutrient management practices and one animal mortality facility was documented, contributing to the county total of 1,034 acres and one facility. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	2,595.5 acres of pest management practices (integrated pest management) were documented, contributing to the county total of 2,597 acres. The county benchmark is 1,110 acres.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	41,400 acres, 29 units and 0 feet of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark is 1,750 acres, 3.5 units and 35 feet.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	662 acres, 2.4 miles and 511 units of habitat management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures. In total, the county benchmark is 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project. Three fish passage barriers were corrected.	Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	50 - Foster

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	996 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Foster WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, range and water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	0 practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, range and water management in the Foster WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	Two culverts were improved for fish passage. The county benchmark of 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project was exceeded; the county total is 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Foster Creek is completely within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive management is needed to address the application of VSPon private land within the Reservation. This entry (Foster/Critical Aquifer Recharge) is the only entry which will be checked for 'Adpative Management?' to avoid repetition in the 5-Year Report, but the task will apply to all critical areas in the WRIA.

Adaptive Management?

☑ Yes ☐ No

The Foster WRIA is completely within the Reservation. Okanogan CD and Okanogan County Planning Department will re-engage with the Colville Confederates Tribes about applying VSP within the Reservation. Currently, the Coundy defers to the Tribes' Planning Department and natural resource programs to monitor and protect critical areas on the Reservation.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures. | **Fish and Wildlife Habitat**

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices. | **50 - Foster**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	996 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Foster WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, range and water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	0 practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, range and water management in the Foster WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	Two culverts were improved for fish passage. The county benchmark of 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project was exceeded; the county total is 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded
50 - Foster

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	Two culverts were improved for fish passage. The county benchmark of 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project was exceeded; the county total is 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, range and water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	0 practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, range and water management in the Foster WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	996 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Foster WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**50 - Foster**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	996 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Foster WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, range and water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	0 practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, range and water management in the Foster WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	Two culverts were improved for fish passage. The county benchmark of 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project was exceeded; the county total is 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**50 - Foster**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for soil management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	996 acres of soil management practices were documented in the Foster WRIA, contributing to the county total of 1,550 acres. The county benchmark of 135 acres was exceeded.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for habitat management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	Two culverts were improved for fish passage. The county benchmark of 880 acres, 0.85 miles, and <1 project was exceeded; the county total is 1,127 acres, 3.0 miles and 535 habitat structures.	Exceeded
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, range and water management practices. Practices within each WRIA were recorded.	0 practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, range and water management in the Foster WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Not met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	51 - Nespelem

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat. Practices are documented by WRIA.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

The Nespelem WRIA is completely within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive management is needed to address the application of VSPon private land within the Reservation. This entry (Foster/Critical Aquifer Recharge) is the only entry which will be checked for 'Adpative Management?' to avoid repetition in the 5-Year Report, but the task will apply to all critical areas in the WRIA.

Adaptive Management?

☑ Yes ☐ No

The Nespelem WRIA is completely within the Reservation. Okanogan CD and Okanogan County Planning Department will re-engage with the Colville Confederates Tribes about applying VSP within the Reservation. Currently, the Coundy defers to the Tribes' Planning Department and natural resource programs to monitor and protect critical areas on the Reservation.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

51 - Nespelem

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat. Practices are documented by WRIA.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded

51 - Nespelem

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat. Practices are documented by WRIA.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Geologic Hazard

51 - Nespelem

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat. Practices are documented by WRIA.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	51 - Nespelem

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the San Poil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

---

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% (~8,800 acres)of the Counties agricultural land. Some land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation and conduct outreach to watersheds without documented implementation practices, although they contain a low percentage of agricultural lands.

** To reduce repitition, this entry will be marked for Adaptive Management and not on other Sanpoil critical areas, although adaptive management will apply to all critical areas.**

Adaptive Management?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Re-evaluate 'Access Road' as a metric for its value as a Key Stewardship Practice and protection metric.

Consider forest health practices as a key stewardship practice for fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.

Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation. Consider documenting forest health practices as key stewardship practices for fish and wildife habitat conservation areas.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures. | **Fish and Wildlife Habitat**

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices. | **52 - Sanpoil**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the San Poil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

---

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% (~8,800 acres)of the Counties agricultural land. Some land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation and conduct outreach towatersheds without documented implementation practices, although they contain a low percentage of agricultural lands.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded

52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the San Poil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% (~8,800 acres)of the Counties agricultural land. Some land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation and conduct outreach towatersheds without documented implementation practices, although they contain a low percentage of agricultural lands.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the San Poil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% (~8,800 acres)of the Counties agricultural land. Some land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation and conduct outreach towatersheds without documented implementation practices, although they contain a low percentage of agricultural lands.

Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	52 - Sanpoil

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat. Practices are documented by WRIA.	No VSP practices were documented in the Sanpoil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% (~8,800 acres)of the Counties agricultural land.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Re-evaluate 'Access Road' as a metric for its value as a Key Stewardship Practice and protection metric.

Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation. Consider documenting forest health practices as key stewardship practices for fish and wildife habitat conservation areas.

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?
☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments
The County's protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

Benchmarks are not associated with specific critical areas because conservation practices have multiple natural resource benefits.

The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA contains only 2% (~7,300 acres)of the County's agricultural land. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA is completely within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive management is needed to address the application of VSP on private land within the Reservation. This entry (Lower Lake Roosevelt/Critical Aquifer Recharge) is the only entry which will be checked for 'Adaptive Management?' to avoid repetition in the 5-Year Report, but the task will apply to all critical areas in the WRIA.

Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA contains only 2% (~7,300 acres)of the County's agricultural land. All land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded

53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA contains only 2% (~7,300 acres)of the County's agricultural land. All land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Geologic Hazard

53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured County-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA contains only 2% (~7,300 acres)of the County's agricultural land. All land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for six stewardship practice categories: Soil, Water, Nutrient, Pest, Range and Habitat.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA contains only 2% (~7,300 acres)of the County's agricultural land. All land is within the Colville Reservation. Adaptive Management will clarify application of VSP within the Reservation.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, water, soil and habitat management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	0 VSP practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, soil or habitat management in the Kettle WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	1,299 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark of 1,750 acres, 3.5 units was exceeded. 0 feet of 'Access Road' practice was installed; the county benchmark is 35 feet.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Kettle WRIA contains ~ 7% of the County's agriculture. Most of the WRIA is located in Ferry County. Adaptive Management will conduct outreach within the Kettle WRIA to gain VSP participants. The Work Group will also consider adding forest health practices to the VSP work plan. Forest improvement activities are more common in the Kettle WRIA.

** To reduce repitition in the 5-Year Report, only this entry will be marked for Adaptive Management and not on other Kettle critical areas, although adaptive management will apply to ALL critical areas.**

Adaptive Management?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, water, soil and habitat management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	0 VSP practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, soil or habitat management in the Kettle WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	1,299 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark of 1,750 acres, 3.5 units was exceeded. 0 feet of 'Access Road' practice was installed; the county benchmark is 35 feet.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Kettle WRIA contains ~ 7% of the County's agriculture. Most of the WRIA is located in Ferry County. Adaptive Management will conduct outreach within the Kettle WRIA to gain VSP participants. The Work Group will also consider adding forest health practices to the VSP work plan. Forest improvement activities are more common in the Kettle WRIA.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded

60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, water, soil and habitat management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	0 VSP practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, soil or habitat management in the Kettle WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	1,299 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark of 1,750 acres, 3.5 units was exceeded. 0 feet of 'Access Road' practice was installed; the county benchmark is 35 feet.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Kettle WRIA contains ~ 7% of the County's agriculture. Most of the WRIA is located in Ferry County. Adaptive Management will conduct outreach within the Kettle WRIA to gain VSP participants. The Work Group will also consider adding forest health practices to the VSP work plan. Forest improvement activities are more common in the Kettle WRIA.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, water, soil and habitat management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	0 VSP practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, soil or habitat management in the Kettle WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	1,299 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark of 1,750 acres, 3.5 units was exceeded. 0 feet of 'Access Road' practice was installed; the county benchmark is 35 feet.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Kettle WRIA contains ~ 7% of the County's agriculture. Most of the WRIA is located in Ferry County. Adaptive Management will conduct outreach within the Kettle WRIA to gain VSP participants. The Work Group will also consider adding forest health practices to the VSP work plan. Forest improvement activities are more common in the Kettle WRIA.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of implemented soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for range management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	1,299 acres of range management practices were documented, contributing to the county totals of 46,136 acres, 29 units and 0 feet. The county benchmark of 1,750 acres, 3.5 units was exceeded. 0 feet of 'Access Road' practice was installed; the county benchmark is 35 feet.	Not met
Benchmarks are measured county-wide for pest, nutrient, water, soil and habitat management practices. Practices are documented by WRIA.	0 VSP practices were documented towards pest, nutrient, soil or habitat management in the Kettle WRIA. All VSP benchmarks were met for the County, except for the Access Road measure for range management.	Met

Benchmark Met?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The County protection benchmarks for soil management, water management, nutrient management, pest management, and habitat management were all exceeded. For range management practices, the targets for acres and units of practices were met (prescribed grazing and watering facilities, for example) but the target for Access Road of 35 feet was not met.

The Kettle WRIA contains ~ 7% of the County's agriculture. Most of the WRIA is located in Ferry County. Adaptive Management will conduct outreach within the Kettle WRIA to gain VSP participants. The Work Group will also consider adding forest health practices to the VSP work plan. Forest improvement activities are more common in the Kettle WRIA.

Adaptive Management?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
48 - Methow

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Methow, at least 1,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed at least 52 cfs towards streamflow in the Methow WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Methow WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**48 - Methow**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Methow, at least 1,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed at least 52 cfs towards streamflow in the Methow WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Methow WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**48 - Methow**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Methow, at least 1,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed at least 52 cfs towards streamflow in the Methow WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Methow WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	48 - Methow

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Methow, at least 1,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed at least 52 cfs towards streamflow in the Methow WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Methow WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	48 - Methow

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Methow, at least 1,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed at least 52 cfs towards streamflow in the Methow WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Methow WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Okanogan, at least 3,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed towards streamflow improvements in Loup Loup and Salmon Creeks.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Okanogan WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Okanogan, at least 3,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed towards streamflow improvements in Loup Loup and Salmon Creeks.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Okanogan WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Frequently Flooded
49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Okanogan, at least 3,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed towards streamflow improvements in Loup Loup and Salmon Creeks.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Okanogan WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.

Geologic Hazard
49 - Okanogan

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Okanogan, at least 3,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed towards streamflow improvements in Loup Loup and Salmon Creeks.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Okanogan WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**49 - Okanogan**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation. Additionally, conservation easements and trusted/leased water are considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. In the Okanogan, at least 3,000 acres of agricultural land was enrolled in a conservation easement. Leases and infrastructure upgrades contributed towards streamflow improvements in Loup Loup and Salmon Creeks.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Okanogan WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**50 - Foster**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	50 - Foster

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	50 - Foster

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. V	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	50 - Foster

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	50 - Foster

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures. Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	Critical Aquifer Recharge 51 - Nespelem

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	13 of 14 target benchmark metrics were exceeded for the County. Conservation easements and water trusts/leases were implemented in the Okanogan WRIA.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures. Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 51 - Nespelem

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met.	N/A

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**51 - Nespelem**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**51 - Nespelem**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**51 - Nespelem**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Nespelem WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**52 - Sanpoil**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Sanpoil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**52 - Sanpoil**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Sanpoil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**52 - Sanpoil**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Sanpoil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**52 - Sanpoil**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Sanpoil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**52 - Sanpoil**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Sanpoil WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures. Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	Critical Aquifer Recharge 53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met? **Comments** **Adaptive Management?**

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring **Monitoring sufficient?**

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures. Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat 53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met? **Comments** **Adaptive Management?**

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring **Monitoring sufficient?**

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Wetlands
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	No practices were documented in the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. All county protection benchmarks were exceeded, except the Access Road metric, a small component of the range management practice type (as documented in other entries of this report).	Met

Benchmark Met? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	**60 - Kettle**

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the “Access Road” metric, which was not met. Forest health practices were installed in the Kettle WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

Adaptive Management? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Fish and Wildlife Habitat
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. Forest health practices were installed in the Kettle WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. Forest health practices were installed in the Kettle WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring

All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.

Monitoring sufficient?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures. Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	Geologic Hazard 60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. Forest health practices were installed in the Kettle WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures. Benchmark: 2 - Achieve participation beyond 2021 target levels for soil, water, nutrient, pest, range or habitat management practices.	Wetlands 60 - Kettle

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
Enhancement is achieved by exceeding target protection metrics for key stewardship practice implementation for the County. Conservation easements and trusted/leased water are also considered enhancements.	All protection metrics were exceeded except the "Access Road" metric, which was not met. Forest health practices were installed in the Kettle WRIA.	Met

Benchmark Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☐ Yes ☐ No		☐ Yes ☐ No

Benchmark Monitoring	Monitoring sufficient?
All documented practices were planned and installed with assistance from NRCS or Okanogan CD Planners or organizations working with individuals on fish habitat recovery projects. The projects and practices in this report included site specific, on-the ground elements for their plans. Each project was planned to NRCS specification and/or with specific habitat improvement goals.	☑ Yes ☐ No

Goal Results

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 8% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Methow WRIA. As documented in the benchmarks, a diverse set of practices were installed within the WRiA Critical area protection was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. The 'Access Road' metric is a small component of the overall range management suite of practices and since the other range management metrics were significantly exceeded, protection was achieved without implementing the 'Access Road' practice.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 71% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Okanogan WRIA. Prescribed grazing is a practice which protects wetlands on rangeland, the most abundant agricultural land use. Fence and livestock exclusion is used to protect wetlands in high impact locations. Critical area protection was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Foster Creek contains 9% of the Counties private agricultural land. The Foster Creek WRIA in Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation, and most of the WRIA is outside of Okanogan County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Nespelem contains only 1% of the Counties agricultural land. The Nespelem WRIA is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	A portion of the Sanpoil WRIA is within the Colville Reservation and approximately half of the WRIA is within Ferry County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% of the County's agricultural land and is mostly range. Forest health practices are more commonly implemented, although they are not listed as target metrics for VSP. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded except for the 'Access Road' metric of 35 feet within therange management practice type. The overall goal to protect critical areas was achieved by significantly exceeding all other range management metrics.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 2% of the county's agricultural land is mapped within the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. Most of the WRIA is within Lincoln and Ferry Counties. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA within Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The Kettle WRIA contains 7% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is rangeland. Most of the Kettle WRIA is within Ferry County. Although not currently listed as practices in the work plan, forest stand improvement and related forest health practices were more common in the Kettle WRIA. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Conduct outreach to agricultural producers in the WRIA.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 8% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Methow WRIA. Irrigation water managementpractices contribute towards critical aquifer recharge area protection. Effectiveness monitoring did not indicate negative impacts from agricultural operations since 2011. Critical area protection was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Please see the supplemental upload for this report for a detailed list of practices documented in the Methow.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 71% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Okanogan WRIA, and most of the agricultural practices are documented here. Integrated pest management, irrigation water management and animal mortality facilities are practices implemented to reduce negative impacts to critical aquifer recharge areas. Groundwater sampling does not indicate disproportionate impacts from agricultural lands. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet. This practice is a small portion of the overall benchmarks for the County.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Foster Creek contains 9% of the Counties private agricultural land. The Foster Creek WRIA in Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation, and most of the WRIA is outside of Okanogan County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Nespelem contains only 1% of the Counties agricultural land. The Nespelem WRIA is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	A portion of the Sanpoil WRIA is within the Colville Reservation and approximately half of the WRIA is within Ferry County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is dryland. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation. Conduct outreach to agricultural producers in the WRIA.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 2% of the county's agricultural land is mapped within the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. Most of the WRIA is within Lincoln and Ferry Counties. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA within Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The Kettle WRIA contains 7% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is rangeland. Most of the Kettle WRIA is within Ferry County. Although not currently listed as practices in the work plan, forest stand improvement and related forest health practices were more common in the Kettle WRIA. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Conduct outreach to agricultural producers in the WRIA.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 8% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Methow WRIA. Implementation of practices like prescribed grazing protected frequently flooded areas. Critical area protection was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 71% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Okanogan WRIA. Prescribed grazing and tree/shrub establishment are examples of practices installed to protect floodplains. The Okanogan River has a wide and active floodplain, much of which is farmed or developed for other uses. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet. This practice is a small portion of the overall benchmarks for the County.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Foster Creek contains 9% of the Counties private agricultural land. The Foster Creek WRIA in Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation, and most of the WRIA is outside of Okanogan County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Nespelem contains only 1% of the Counties agricultural land. The Nespelem WRIA is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	A portion of the Sanpoil WRIA is within the Colville Reservation and approximately half of the WRIA is within Ferry County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is dryland. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation. Conduct outreach to agricultural producers in the WRIA.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 2% of the county's agricultural land is mapped within the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. Most of the WRIA is within Lincoln and Ferry Counties. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA within Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The Kettle WRIA contains 7% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is rangeland. Most of the Kettle WRIA is within Ferry County. Although not currently listed as practices in the work plan, forest stand improvement and related forest health practices were more common in the Kettle WRIA. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 8% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Methow WRIA.Prescribed grazing and cover crops help protect geologically hazardous areas. Critical area protection was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 71% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Okanogan WRIA. Prescribed grazing is a practice which protects geologically hazardous areas on rangeland, the most abundant agricultural land use. Critical area protection was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Foster Creek contains 9% of the Counties private agricultural land. The Foster Creek WRIA in Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation, and most of the WRIA is outside of Okanogan County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Nespelem contains only 1% of the Counties agricultural land. The Nespelem WRIA is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	A portion of the Sanpoil WRIA is within the Colville Reservation and approximately half of the WRIA is within Ferry County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is dryland. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation. Conduct outreach to agricultural producers in the WRIA.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 2% of the county's agricultural land is mapped within the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. Most of the WRIA is within Lincoln and Ferry Counties. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA within Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The Kettle WRIA contains 7% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is rangeland. Most of the Kettle WRIA is within Ferry County. Although not currently listed as practices in the work plan, forest stand improvement and related forest health practices were more common in the Kettle WRIA. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Conduct outreach to agricultural producers in the WRIA.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 8% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Methow WRIA. Salmon recovery practices are frequently implemented and contribute towards the high level of practice implementation. Habitat trends indicate fish and wildlife habitat is not declining. Critical area protection was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 71% of the county's agricultural lands are within the Okanogan WRIA, and most of the agricultural practices are documented here. Prescribed grazing, tree/shrub establishment and range planting are examples of practices implemented to improve fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. Habitat trend reports do not indicate a decline in habitat quality. Steelhead habitat is mostly trending towards improvement. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet. This practice is a small portion of the overall benchmarks for the County.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Foster Creek contains 9% of the Counties private agricultural land. The Foster Creek WRIA in Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation, and most of the WRIA is outside of Okanogan County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Nespelem contains only 1% of the Counties agricultural land. The Nespelem WRIA is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas with their codes and natural resource programs. This relationship is established in an interlocal agreement. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	A portion of the Sanpoil WRIA is within the Colville Reservation and approximately half of the WRIA is within Ferry County. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The Sanpoil WRIA contains only 2% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is dryland. The county's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation. Conduct outreach to agricultural producers in the WRIA.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Approximately 2% of the county's agricultural land is mapped within the Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA. Most of the WRIA is within Lincoln and Ferry Counties. The Lower Lake Roosevelt WRIA within Okanogan County is completely within the Colville Reservation. The County defers to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to protect critical areas within the Reservation. The County's protection benchmark metrics were met, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☑ Yes ☐ No Re-engage with the Colville Confederated Tribes about the application of VSP within the boundaries of the Reservation.

Goal: 1 - Protect critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	The Kettle WRIA contains 7% of the Counties agricultural land, much of which is rangeland. Most of the Kettle WRIA is within Ferry County. Although not currently listed as practices in the work plan, forest stand improvement and related forest health practices were more common in the Kettle WRIA. The County's protection benchmark metrics were exceeded, except for the 'Access Road' metric of 70 feet.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Wetlands
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Frequently Flooded
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Geologic Hazard
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
48 - Methow

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Trusted water rights and leases improved habitat for salmon and steelhead.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
49 - Okanogan

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Trusted water rights and leases improved habitat for salmon and steelhead.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
50 - Foster

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
51 - Nespelem

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
52 - Sanpoil

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
53 - Lower Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented.Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Goal: 2 - Enhance critical areas through voluntary measures.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
60 - Kettle

Goal Met?	Comments	Adaptive Management?
☑ Yes ☐ No	Critical area enhancement was achieved by meeting and exceeding all but one of the target protection metrics. Of 14 measures, only the 'Access Road' practice (35 feet) was not implemented. Exceeding the other targets made up for the improvement anticipated from 35 feet of improved road.	☐ Yes ☑ No

Participation Strategies and Performance Metrics

Enter your best estimate of the number of Producers in the County watersheds:

Goal: 3 - Provide educational opportunities related to stewardship of critical areas and agriculture.
Benchmark: 3 - 20 participants attend an educational workshop, farm tour, or other form of educational event of program.

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
VSP Work Group and technical lead (Okanogan CD) communicate with local stakeholders and agencies to plan and document participation in educational events.	The following events are a few of the educational opportunities held since the VSP Work Group formed in 2016: • 2017 & 2018 Soil Health Field Day – 55 & 45 Participants • 2017 Okanogan Cattleman's Range Monitoring Tour – 40 participants • 2018 Okanogan CD Conservation Celebration, Ranching, Wolves, Wildlife – 85 participants • 2018 Fuel for Fire, Forage for Cattle: Grazing Management with Stockmanship – 30 participants • 2018 Water Right Workshops – Okanogan & Tonasket – 20 participants • 2019 Livestock Watering Techniques Farm Tour - 4 participants • 2019 Managing Your Land for Wildlife and Wildfire- 4 participants • 2019 Okanogan CD Conservation Celebration, Sharp-tailed Grouse Recovery in Okanogan - 85 participants • 2020 Soil Health Workshop- 25 participants	Exceeded

Goal: 4 - Encourage participation in Individual VSP Stewardship Checklists.
Benchmark: 5 - No numeric benchmark is set for individual stewardship plans completed.

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
The strategy for this goal is to collect and review checklists and develop a benchmark.	The VSP checklist is currently in review and will be redeveloped to be more relevant to different types of agricultural land and producers. No checklists have been completed.	Met

Goal: 5 - Encourage participation in stewardship practice planning with Okanogan CD.
Benchmark: 4 - Complete 3 practice plans in 5 years.

Strategy/Metric Description	Accomplishment	Status
The measure of this metric is the number of producers planning projects with Okanogan CD Planners.	Okanogan CD has worked with at least 5 producers per year to plan irrigation efficiency projects, prescribed grazing plans, wetland and riparian protection projects or off-stream watering systems. Okanogan CD staff worked with three irrigation companies/districtsto plan large-scale efficiency upgrades during the reporting period. Two were implemented.	Exceeded

Critical Area Monitoring

Monitoring Activity: Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment tool for Upper Columbia Steelhead

Included Critical Area(s):

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data	Other, explain:	CCT Habitat trend monitoring and modeling

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly): odel data is annual field sampling and inventory of habitat characteristics. Model output are trends between 2013 and 2017.

Desired accuracy of the Analysis: | Observed mean:

Number of samples drawn from existing data: | Observed standard deviation:

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.): None

Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations: Salmon, Johnson, Bonaparte, and Antoine Creeks, as well as the Similkameen River show improving habitat potential for Upper Columbia steelhead. Only one major tributary, Loup Loup Creek, showed a decline. However, this is likely due to sediment deposition from post-wildfire flooding during the evaluation period. Flow improved in Loup Loup Creek after 2011 when a water lease agreement was established with one of the irrigation water companies, which also monitors for passage impediments. EDT Dashboard https://ecosystems.azurewebsites.net/hstr-okanogan/

Adaptive Management needed? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Proposed Monitoring: The Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment tool works well for the Okanogan River tributaries, detecting habitat changes for Upper Columbia steelhead, one of the regions most sensistive species. EDT covers sections of tributaries near the mainstem river. We will consider monitoring strategies for upper watershed habitat conditions.
EDT modeling for the Methow is in development and will be available for the Methow WRIA. EDT covers sections of tributaries near the mainstem river, where steelhead

Monitoring Activity: Groundwater monitoring data from Dept. of Health- 2015 to 2020: Group A and B wells

Included Critical Area(s):

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)	DOH samples collected between 2015 and 2020.

Desired accuracy of the monitoring ☐ Number of samples/sites ☐

Observed mean ☐ Observed standard deviation ☐

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)	None

Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations	Of 1,339 samples analyzed for nitrate and coliform samples from Group A and Group B wells 41 exceedances were documented from active wellsin the Okanogan and Methow WRIAs. Of those exceedances, 17 wellhead protection areas overlapped with agricultural lands. Irrigated orchards were associated with nitrate exceedances. Others were associated with recreational landuse, such as campgrounds, or wells located near multiple dwellings with on-site septic systems.

Adaptive Management needed? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Proposed Monitoring	Few surface water quality samples have been collected within Okanogan County in recent years. Okanogan CD will assist WSDA with the pesticide data collection planned for 2021 and is pursuing funding for stream water quality monitoring in the Okanogan River tributaries. Surface water quality data will help monitor the protection of critical areas and target outreach and planning locations.

Monitoring Activity: Review WDFW Fish Passage map and corrections on agricultural lands

Included Critical Area(s):

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data	Other, explain:	WDFW Fish Passage

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Desired accuracy of the Analysis		Observed mean	
Number of samples drawn from existing data		Observed standard deviation	

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations	Eight fish passage improvements were completed on private agricultural lands through the FFFPP or salmon recovery related projects, demonstrating improvement to Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas.

Adaptive Management needed? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Monitoring Activity: Freshwater Information Network and Freshwater Quality Index

Included Critical Area(s):

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data: Ecology

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Desired accuracy of the Analysis

Observed mean

Number of samples drawn from existing data

Observed standard deviation

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Of the three stations (Poorman Creek, Methow River at Twisp Bridge, Methow River upstream of Pateros) regularly scored on the Freshwater Quality Index, two were given an overall annual rating of “good- meeting standards to protect aquatic life” for 2015-2018. The third received a “moderate concern” rating for 2015, though that improved to a “good” rating for 2016-2018.

Adaptive Management needed? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Monitoring Activity: Water quality data from the Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation

Included Critical Area(s):

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data	Other, explain:	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation temperature loggers

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Desired accuracy of the Analysis

Observed mean

Number of samples drawn from existing data

Observed standard deviation

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Data between 2012 and 2019 was reviewed for two sites that could be impacted by adjacent or upstream agricultural activity.Of these two sites, in 2017 the Beaver Creek temperature logger recorded approximately one month of water temperatures which exceeded safe levels for salmonid survival (20 degrees C). However, this watershed and riparian area burned in the 2014 Carlton Complex Fire and impacts to water quality cannot be directly linked to agriculture.

Adaptive Management needed? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Monitoring Activity: WDFW species management report, Recovery of Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse in Washington: Progress Report

Included Critical Area(s):

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data	Other, explain:	WDFW

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Desired accuracy of the Analysis

Observed mean

Number of samples drawn from existing data

Observed standard deviation

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Sharp-tailed Grouse population reports were reviewed to reflect the condition of functions and values related to shrub-steppe, a common habitat type in Okanogan County. Population numbers have recently improved related to translocation efforts by WDFW which includes a release on private property in the Tunk Valley. Large wildfires in 2014 and 2015 led to significant changes in shrub-steppe habitat.

Adaptive Management needed? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Proposed Monitoring

The VSP Work Group will consider additional on-the-ground monitoring of range/shrubsteppe habitat condition in the County. Fish and wildlife management reports are helpful to characterize how a habitat is functioning for high priority species, addressing the intention of VSP to protect 'functions and values'. Range inventories can help determine specific rangeland and habitat improvement strategies and potentially trends if a long-term monitoring plan on a site is possible.

Monitoring Activity: Landscape change detection, 2011-2017

Included Critical Area(s):

Wetlands

Frequently Flooded

Geologic Hazard

Input datasets used	Landsat 05 July 23,2011 Landsat 08 Aug 8, 2017 NAIP 2011 NAIP 2017 LANDSAT and NDVI review provided general impressions of landscape and critical area changes but were difficult to parse from annual/seasonal weather variability and climate. All floodplain/agricultural parcels were reviewed. To review trends in wetlands and steep slopes, a random sample was generated and a classified NDVI value from 1 to 5 was attributed by comparing the location of the random location to the NDVI 2017-2011 raster.
Year of map/imagery for comparison with 2011 baseline	2017
Spatial accuracy of least accurate input layer	
Units for spatial accuracy	
Classification accuracy of least accurate input layer	
Field verification of overall accuracy: Ommission	
Field verification of overall accuracy: Commission	
Field verification of overall accuracy: Kappa	
Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations	Floodplains: NDVI changes that suggest a loss of vegetation cover were rare, but three locations suggest removal of irrigation water produced more brown conditions in 2017, compared to 2011. Two sites were now-fallow agricultural properties. It is not uncommon for agricultural irrigation to increase surface water or near-surface soil moisture in adjacent land. Individual pixels along the rivers indicate changes in the riparian vegetation, while large blocks of pixels usually were associated with changes in agricultural lands. Geologically hazardous areas (mostly steep slopes) were mostly unchanged between 2011 and 2017. Indications of less vegetation was a result of wildfire, which frequently burns hot on steep slopes and high tree mortality. Our NDVI process was not effective for evaluating wetlands. Changes were related to increased surface areas of ponds and potholes, now-fallow agricultural lands, and seasonal variations.

Adaptive Management needed? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Proposed Monitoring	The VSP Work Group will work with agencies to consider monitoring strategies for geologically hazardous areas, floodplains and wetland functions and values, including suggestions for differentiating climate impacts. While we were able to detect landscape changes, the high level of seasonal variability in arid and semi-arid landscapes is a challenge for identifying the source of detected change.

Monitoring Activity: Beaver Creek Reach Assessment: Yakama Nation and Tetratech, 2017

Included Critical Area(s):

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data	Other, explain:	Yakama Nation salmonid habitat assessment

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Desired accuracy of the Analysis

Observed mean

Number of samples drawn from existing data

Observed standard deviation

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

Is the observation statistically significant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Beaver Creek is a tributary to the Methow River. The Reach Assessment identified impairments and priority restoration strategies. Streamflow restoration is one of the top strategies for Beaver Creek and in recent years flow has improved due in part to agricultural irrigation leases and irrigation efficiencies.

Adaptive Management needed? ☐ Yes ☑ No