



EPA Puget Sound Financial and Ecosystem Accounting Tracking System (FEATS) v. September 2012 for Lead Organization Subawardees

Photo by Rebecca Pirtle, Editor, Kingston Community News (Doe-Kag-Wats Estuary of the Suquamish Tribe)

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Federal Grant Number	PA-00J322-01	*2a. Reporting Period Start Date:	4/1/2017	*2b. Reporting Period End Date:	9/30/2017
3. Subaward Organization (Name and complete address including zip code)			4. Subaward Project Manager Contact Information		
Name: Skagit River System Cooperative Address 1: P.O. Box 368 Address 2: City: La Conner State: WA Zip Code: 98257-			Name: Steve Hinton Phone: (360) 391-1354 Ext: Fax: () - Email: shinton@skagitcoop.org		
5a. EPA Program		5b. Subaward Project Title and Contract No.		*6. Collaborating Organizations/Partners	
LO - Tribal		Skagit Recovery Plan Stewardship Project / 14EPA PSP428			

Subawardee Submission Instructions: LO fills in the white boxes. Subawardee fills in the yellow boxes (boxes with asterisks). Refer to guidance document for how to fill out the boxes. After filling out the yellow boxes, save and e-mail it to your LO Project Manager for approval. LO will roll up the information and submit to EPA for approval.	LO Project Manager: Dani Madrone LO: Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission Phone: 360.528.4318 email: dmadrone@nwifc.org LO Program Coordinator: LO: Phone: email: EPA Project Officer: Lisa Chang	*7a. Name/Title of Person Submitting Report	Steve Hinton Director of Restoration
		*7b. Date Report Submitted	10/25/2017

FUNDING/COST ANALYSIS

8a. Total Assistance Amount Awarded:	\$112,450.00	8b. Funding Year (Federal Fiscal Year Funds Appropriated)	FY 2014 ----- ----- -----	*9. Amount Spent To-Date:	\$112,450.00	*10. Amount Reimbursed To-Date:	\$112,450.00
11. Match Amount Required	\$0.00	*12. Total Match Amount Spent and Documented To-Date:		*13. Have you experienced any cost overruns or high unit costs?	Yes		
*14. What issues or questions do you need the LO Project Manager to respond to?							

BUDGET UPDATE

	15a. APPROVED BUDGET			*15b. SPENT TO-DATE		
	LO (EPA) Funds	MATCH	TOTAL	LO (EPA) Funds	MATCH	TOTAL
Personnel	\$62,814.00	\$0.00	\$62,814.00	\$64,474.26	\$0.00	\$64,474.26
Fringe Benefits	\$21,356.00	\$0.00	\$21,356.00	\$23,357.31	\$0.00	\$23,357.31
Travel	\$1,430.00	\$0.00	\$1,430.00	\$32.30	\$0.00	\$ 32.30
Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ 0.00		\$0.00	\$ 0.00
Supplies	\$1,131.00	\$0.00	\$1,131.00	\$305.59	\$0.00	\$ 305.59
Contracts	\$2,250.00	\$0.00	\$2,250.00	\$2,570.00	\$0.00	\$2,570.00
Other	\$1,500.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$828.51	\$0.00	\$ 828.51
TOTAL DIRECT CHARGES	\$90,480.00	\$0.00	\$90,480.00	\$91,567.97	\$0.00	\$91,567.97
Indirect Charges	\$21,969.00	\$0.00	\$21,969.00	\$20,882.03	\$0.00	\$20,882.03
TOTAL	\$112,450.00	\$0.00	\$112,450.00	\$112,450.00	\$0.00	\$112,450.00
*Explain Any Discrepancies:	Equipment /Vehical Rental & O&M reported under "Other." Personnel and Fringe Benefits exceeded original budget.					

ECOSYSTEM GOALS ADDRESSED

16a. Primary Goal	Healthy Species
16b. Additional Goals	Healthy Habitat -----

DIRECT THREATS ADDRESSED

17a. Primary Threat	-----
17b. Secondary Threat(s)	-----

LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND ACTION AGENDA (Version Adopted August 2012)

18a. Primary Strategic Initiative	Tribal Habitat Priorities
18b. Sub-Strategies Employed	A.1.1 A.6.4 D.4.1.1
18c. Near-Term Actions Supported	

LINKAGES TO EPA PUGET SOUND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

19. Measure(s)	Habitat Restored/Protected -----
----------------	----------------------------------

LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND DASHBOARD INDICATORS

20a. Primary Indicator	Floodplains
20b. Secondary Indicators	Freshwater Quality -----

PROJECT LOCATION

21a. Latitude	48.389697	21b. Longitude	-122.500713
21c. Hydrologic Unit Code	17110007 - Lower Skagit	-----	-----
21d. Action Area	Whidbey	-----	-----

MEASURES OF SUCCESS (Key Outputs)

*22a. Description (e.g., "shellfish beds reopened")	*22b. Unit (e.g., "acres")	*22c. Project Target ("number")	*22d. Project Measure To-Date ("number")

PROJECT MILESTONES

Instructions: In the tables below, please explain your progress toward meeting agreed outputs for the period, **reasons for slippages**, and any additional information including **reflections, lessons learned, and/or thoughtful analysis**. When appropriate, include analysis and information of **cost overruns or high unit costs**, and changes to work plan or budget not requiring prior approval from EPA. We encourage photo documentation - please attach to the report as a separate document.

23a. Subaward Work Plan Component/Task: Coordination and collaboration					
23b. 2012 Action Agenda Near-Term Action(s) Supported:					
*23c. Estimated Costs: \$112,450.00 Actual Costs to Date: \$112,450.00 (If required to report – contact your Project Manager)					
23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description (include due date)	*23f. Date of Status	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
1.1	Establish regular meeting schedule and location for core technical group	9/30/2017	COMPLETED	A set meeting routine for the SSWG throughout 2015 & 2016	Regular meetings of the SSWG occurred since March of 2015. Sub groups were established and met regularly. Sub-group's for Hatchery Practices, Hydro power, Habitat and Hydrology produced products for draft plan roll up.
1.2	Attend NOAA Regional Recovery Team Meetings as scheduled by NOAA Recovery Team	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Meeting Agendas; meeting minutes;	Attended meetings on a quarterly basis to share work products and contribute.

				Regular attendance of key personnel	
1.3	Preparation and distribution of meeting materials to core group members	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Timely preparation and distribution of meeting materials and work products	SRSC played lead role in organizing and providing meeting materials in advance of SSWG meetings as well as Sub group meetings.
1.4	Establish topical sub-groups and provide sub-group coordination.	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Tasks and assignments; Coordination between commissioned sub-groups	All topical sub-groups have been met and completed individual work plans. Project managers have been attending all meetings.

23a. Subaward Work Plan Component/Task: Integration of modeling approach

23b. 2012 Action Agenda Near-Term Action(s) Supported:

***23c. Estimated Costs:**
Actual Costs to Date:
(If required to report – contact your Project Manager)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description (include due date)	*23f. Date of Status	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
2.1	Establish consistency with GIS data sets for 2006 and 2015 time steps	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Consistency within and between Habitat data sets	Remote sensed data is completed on schedule. 2015 time step analysis is underway and making headway and will be used in status and trends reporting
2.2	Secure agreement on model inputs relative to life cycle attributes	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Agreement secured	While we thought agreement had been reached on proceeding with a two-stage life cycle model that was developed for the regional recovery planning effort uncertainty around the use of speculative smolt production numbers created controversy. The discussion devolved and now agreement is focused on linking only to retrospective model outputs.
2.3	Integrate retrospective model (Ruff, Anderson & Beamer, in preparation) with modeling approached selected by regional NOAA Recovery Team	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Model selected	Publication for retrospective model is completed. Integration with regional recovery team work is treated in draft plan outputs.

2.4	Begin populating model with agreed upon data	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Life Cycle model compatible with regional approach populated with Skagit specific parameters	Progress stalled out for a significant period over disagreement on modeling inputs and uncertainties with two stage parameters. Course correction was needed here with new tack simplifying overall approach. The Retrospective Model approach will be simple to populate but have less rigor that two stage approach being used by region. Treatment of the two stage inputs is subject of detailed treatment in drfat plan.
-----	--	------------	-----------	--	---

23a. Subaward Work Plan Component/Task: Generate products and narrative that links results to model outputs

23b. 2012 Action Agenda Near-Term Action(s) Supported:

***23c. Estimated Costs:**
Actual Costs to Date:
(If required to report – contact your Project Manager)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description (include due date)	*23f. Date of Status	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
3.1	Draft Chapters of Pressures, Stressors and Recovery Actions related to Habitat processes	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Individual chapters for Draft Recovery Plan; Links to open standards framework; Results chains	Complete. GIS work is completed chapter development underway-delayed by disagreement over modeling inputs.
3.2	Draft Chapters of Pressures, Stressors and Recovery Actions related to Hydro Elements	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Individual chapters for Draft Recovery Plan; Links to open standards framework; Results chains	This portion of the plan is being finalized using other funding sources. Multiple attempts to secure draft materials for the Baker drainage yielded little products from area experts. Draft section remains under construction and approx 90% complete. Hydropower sections still new discussion and input on Baker River Sections.Recovery Actions have yet to be authored.
3.3	Draft Chapters of Pressures, Stressors and Recovery Actions related to Harvest Elements	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Individual chapters for Draft Recovery Plan; Links to open standards	This section remains incomplete under this funding source. Area co-managers have been

				framework; Results chains	negotiating an FMEP with NOAA that forms the basis of this section. Therefore draft remains under construction approx 85% complete. FMEP development completed but waiting input from NOAA review.
3.4	Draft Chapters of Pressures, Stressors and Recovery Actions related to Hatchery Elements	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Individual chapters for Draft Recovery Plan; Links to open standards framework; Results chains	Complete. Discussion of Integrated hatchery proposal will be treated as a research gap in Plan.

23a. Subaward Work Plan Component/Task: Conduct gap analysis and develop research, monitoring and adaptive management modules based on results

23b. 2012 Action Agenda Near-Term Action(s) Supported:

***23c. Estimated Costs:**
Actual Costs to Date:
(If required to report – contact your Project Manager)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description (include due date)	*23f. Date of Status	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
4.1	Gap analysis based on working groups' evaluation of research questions, uncertainties with data, gaps in knowledge and monitoring strategies	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Identified gaps in knowledge base; Priorities in addressing gaps; Timeline for addressing gaps in our knowledge base	Gaps section is still under development as other completed sections bring forward elements for inclusion. Will be completed as project reaches final drafting stages. Sections making headway on gap identification and writeups using common format.
4.2	Draft research Module based on regional priorities	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Specific research actions to address gaps in our knowledge base	Pending development and prioritization of knowledge gaps. Linkage to regional plan will likely lag until stakeholder phase of project gets underway.
4.3	Draft Monitoring Module linked to Skagit MAMP Plan	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Monitoring strategy to inform progress toward goals	MAMP Plan is nearing completion, but will be focused narrowly on habitat status and trends. Section completion awaits final MAMP work products so remains behind schedule.

4.4	Adaptive Management Module linked to Skagit MAMP Plan	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Adaptive management framework for course correction	Same as above
-----	---	------------	-----------	---	---------------

23a. Subaward Work Plan Component/Task: Submit to stakeholders a draft implementation strategy for the recovery of Skagit Steelhead populations

23b. 2012 Action Agenda Near-Term Action(s) Supported:

***23c. Estimated Costs:**

Actual Costs to Date:

(If required to report – contact your Project Manager)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description (include due date)	*23f. Date of Status	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
5.1	Present draft to Regional Steelhead Recovery Group	09/30/2017	COMPLETED	Formal presentation	Draft plan will be ready spring 2018
5.2	Present Draft to Skagit Watershed Council	03/31/2017	COMPLETED	Formal presentation	Draft plan will be ready spring 2018
5.3	Present Draft to Skagit LIO	03/31/2017	CANCELLED	Formal presentation	Formation of LIO unlikely in Skagit
5.4	Solicit & incorporate comments	03/31/2017	CANCELLED	6-12 Preparation meetings	Moved to Stakeholder phase of project.

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS (specific to reporting period)

*24a. Task No., Sub-Task No.	*24b. Challenge	*24c. Solution
2.2 Secure agreement on model inputs relative to life cycle attributes	Local technical experts had planned on developing a three stage life cycle model. However, demands on work loads from other population concerns (e.g. coho, chum) limited the time and resources available to dedicate to this complex model development	Technical staff worked closely with regional modelers to evaluate and contribute to two stage life cycle model. Adoption of the 2 stage model provided the needed sophistication without requiring new work. However, further work is still needed with two stage model. because of uncertainties we will use the retrospective approach as the framework and discuss gaps that need to be addressed to shore up two stage approach.
2.3 Integrate retrospective model (Ruff, Anderson & Beamer, in preparation) with modeling approached selected by regional NOAA Recovery Team	The complexities of integrating these two approaches is now more apparent and the quality of data limits our ability to get agreement on approach to integration	Discuss uncertainties of two stage model and move those gaps contributing to uncertainty to the data gap/monitoring chapter for future resolution. Process with retrospective modeling approach as organizing principle.
2.4 Begin populating model with agreed upon data	Achieving agreement on data inputs is time and resource consuming.	Keeping focused on not incorporating new work and staying keyed in on historic and archival data sources.

3.3 Draft Chapters of Pressures, Stressors and Recovery Actions related to Harvest Elements	Co-manager deliberations this spring related to setting harvest was dominated by conflict largely related to poor forecasts with coho returns. This conflict make it difficult to maintain focus on steelhead recovery work.	Resolution of conflict, in part due to policy positions and guidance provided by NOAA. Harvest still remains a contentious issue. FMEP proposal is being reviewed with increased harvest rates being proposed.
5.3 Present Draft to Skagit LIO	Formation of LIO unlikely	We will look to present and engage PSP at a regional level once draft plan is completed
Overall Plan completion	Getting joint cooperation from multiple agencies while policy guidance emphasized other tasks around other species, Harvest Management and Hatchery Operations	Drafting of Plan has been slowed considerably by competing interests. Draft is still underdevelopment but once ready for release will likely be lacking the depth and breath of support we had hoped to achieve.

HIGHLIGHTS/LESSONS LEARNED/REFLECTIONS

***25.**

The Team approached started off as an ambitious effort to bring co-managers together. However Agency policy priorities soon stymied progress as we saw several authors retasked to the FMEP and Hatchery conversations with the State & NOAA. Both these elements need to be related to the recovery context, but that dialog was difficult to elevate in priority among key partner groups.

We also struggled with the modelling approach. Insufficient funding mad it difficult to pursue our desired 3 stage model, and uncertainties with the 2 stage approach among managers made it difficult to get consensus on the approach pursued by the State. These disagreements continued to hamper authoring as the plan outline had to change in accordance to those decisions.