

# **Puget Sound Partnership and Recovery Implementation Technical Team 2010 Three Year Work Program Review Hood Canal Watershed**

## Introduction

The 2010 Three-Year Work Program Update is the fifth year of implementation since the Recovery Plan was finalized in 2005. The Puget Sound Partnership, as the regional organization for salmon recovery, along with the Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT), as the NOAA-appointed regional technical team for salmon recovery, perform an assessment of the development and review of these work programs in order to be as effective as possible in the coming years.

These work programs are intended to provide a road map for implementation of the salmon recovery plans and to help establish a recovery trajectory for the first three years of implementation.

In April 2010, two of the fourteen watershed chapter areas submitted early three-year work program updates on accomplishments, status of actions, and proposed actions that built on the work programs since 2006. The remaining twelve watershed chapter areas submitted their three-year work program updates in May 2010, with one submitting in June 2010.

The feedback below is intended to assist the watershed recovery plan implementation team as it continues to address actions and implementation of their salmon recovery plan. The feedback is also used by the RITT, the Recovery Council Work Group, and the Puget Sound Partnership to inform the continued development and implementation of the regional work program. This includes advancing on issues such as adaptive management, all H integration, and capacity within the watershed teams. The feedback will also stimulate further discussion of recovery objectives to determine what the best investments are for salmon recovery over the next three years.

## Guidance for the 2010 work program update reviews

Factors to be considered by the RITT in performing its technical review of the Update included:

- 1) *Consistency question*: Are the suites of actions and top priorities identified in the watershed's three-year work plan/program consistent with the hypotheses and strategies identified in the Recovery Plan (Volume I and II of the Recovery Plan, NOAA supplement)?
- 2) *Pace/Status question*: Is implementation of the salmon recovery plan on-track for achieving the 10-year goal(s)? If not, why and what are the key priorities to move forward?
- 3) *Sequence/Timing question*: Is the sequencing and timing of actions appropriate for the current stage of implementation?
- 4) *Next big challenge question*: Does the three-year work plan/program reflect any new challenges or adaptive management needs that have arisen over the past year?

Watersheds were also provided with the following four questions, answers to which the Recovery Council Work Group and the Partnership ecosystem recovery coordinators assessed in performing their policy review of the three-year work program:

- 1) *Consistency question*: Are the suites of actions and top priorities identified in the watershed's three-year work plan/program consistent with the needs identified in the Recovery Chapter (Volume I and II of the Recovery Plan, NOAA supplement)? Are the suites of actions and top priorities identified in the watershed's three-year work plan/program consistent with the Action Agenda?
- 2) *Pace/Status question*: Is implementation of salmon recovery on-track for achieving the 10-year goals?
- 3) *What is needed question*: What type of support is needed to help support this watershed in achieving its recovery chapter goals? Are there any changes needed in the suites of actions to achieve the watershed's recovery chapter goals?
- 4) *Next big challenge question*: Does the three-year work program reflect any new challenges or adaptive management needs that have arisen over the past year either within the watershed or across the region?

## **Review**

*The following review consists of four components: a regional technical review that identifies and discusses technical topics of regional concern; a watershed-specific technical review focusing on the specific above-mentioned technical questions and the work being done in the watershed as reflected by the three year work plan; a regional policy review that identifies and discusses policy topics of regional concern; and a watershed-specific policy review focusing on the specific above-mentioned policy questions and the work being done in the watershed as reflected by the three year work plan. These four components are the complete work plan review.*

### **I. Puget Sound Recovery Implementation Technical Team Review**

The RITT reviewed each of the fourteen individual watershed chapter's salmon recovery three-year work program updates in May and June 2010. The RITT evaluated each individual watershed according to the four questions provided above. In the review, the RITT identified a common set of regional review comments for technical feedback that are applicable to all fourteen watersheds, as well as watershed specific feedback using the four questions. The regional review, along with the watershed specific review comments, are included below.

#### **Regional Technical Review: 2010 Three-Year Work Plans – Common Themes**

In addressing the review questions at the watershed level, as outlined above, the RITT also noted general comments common to all watersheds within the region. Four of these region-wide themes are listed below.

##### **1. H-Integration**

The work plans continue to emphasize habitat restoration projects for understandable reasons. However, salmon recovery also requires habitat protection, and hatchery and harvest management actions. **H-integration** has been considered in a number of watersheds by assessing progress towards plan goals in all of the H's. New projects using EPA funds to specifically address habitat protection for some watersheds came about because an overview of progress in all H's showed that habitat protection had received less attention than the other H's. It is important for all watersheds to assess how the work in each H will affect and be affected by the other H's. For example, do exploitation rate ceilings in harvest management provide sufficient fish to take advantage of newly restored habitat; is progress in restoring one type of habitat negated by the loss of the same kind of habitat due to inadequate protection? These kinds of questions will be an important component of adaptive management. Therefore, it would be advantageous to address them in subsequent 3-year work plans.

A challenge that still has not been met in most watersheds is to coordinate actions in all H's to the same set of hypotheses and strategies that underlie the watershed's recovery plan chapter. For example, it should be clear how a hatchery program set up to supplement production addresses the limiting factors for that watershed in a fashion complimentary to the habitat restoration and protection work in the same watershed. It is important to keep in mind that actions in all H's are aimed at moving the populations towards recovered levels of the same set of VSP parameters. Therefore, it would be advantageous for the managers of all the H's to work with each other towards a common vision of how their actions, in combination, will achieve this recovery.

Six steps of H-integration were suggested at a Shared Strategy workshop in 2006 to help groups begin this process). Some watersheds are working through them in a systematic fashion. We continue to support these steps as useful guidance for assuring that all H's are part of each watershed's recovery plan implementation.

1. Identify the people needed to participate, covering all Hs. Bring them into the process.
2. Gain a common understanding of how the H's influence the salmon system.
3. Agree upon common goals for improving salmon.
4. Select a suite of complimentary actions covering the Hs that address the goals (these should then be placed in the work plans).
5. Document implementation of actions and expected outcomes (in work plans).
6. Monitor, report, and adjust (adaptive management!).

## 2. Adaptive Management

One of the biggest challenges that the RITT has consistently identified for implementing the Puget Sound Chinook Recovery Plan is the development of realistic, useful, and applicable **adaptive management plans** at the watershed level. The Recovery Plan identified these as the key tool for addressing the scientific uncertainties inherent in the plan, yet developing this tool remains a challenge in 2010. To help identify needs, to provide a consistent template for planning and prioritizing monitoring, to develop a

process for refining short-term objectives and 10-year goals, and to increase the technical capacity of the watersheds to complete these plans, the RITT began working with three watersheds – San Juan Islands, Skagit, and Hood Canal - using the Open Standards conservation planning approach with the intent of expanding the work sequentially to other watersheds. As this work began, however, watersheds that did not want to wait for the RITT asked that it develop a template that they could use to prepare for RITT involvement. The template will be completed by July 1, 2010. The RITT will continue to work with watersheds on developing adaptive management plans using this template under a revised time table. Although RITT support will be available to each watershed, the process of building the adaptive management and monitoring plans will still demand time, commitment, and resources from the watershed leads, planners and implementers of actions associated with the Recovery Plan.

### **3. Climate Change**

Climate change is expected to affect the fundamental aquatic and terrestrial processes that control the quality and quantity of habitats for Pacific salmon. This change is the subject of global and regional research, modeling, and planning. For the RITT, Puget Sound Partnership, watershed groups, and other salmon recovery entities, climate change is likely to become a core issue when considering the types and designs of restoration efforts. Specific watershed-scale planning guidance regarding the effect of climate change on salmon and their habitats will require additional study. However, empirical data clearly demonstrate rising air temperatures in the Pacific Northwest during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and regional climate models predict that this trend will continue. Resulting changes can be expected in watershed hydrology (magnitude and timing of peak and base flows), stream and ocean temperatures, ocean currents and coastal circulation, salinity gradients, sea level, and biological diversity. Salmon production is intimately linked with many of these variables.

As ecosystem processes and functions respond to climate change, adaptive strategies will need to be developed to mitigate and compensate in the implementation of salmon recovery efforts. The Puget Sound Chinook Recovery Plan and accompanying NOAA Supplement both indicate that climate change impacts on salmon need to be considered in evaluating recovery. The NOAA Supplement also identifies climate change as one of several “specific technical and policy issues for regional adaptive management and monitoring.” To this end, the RITT will work with watershed groups, Puget Sound Partnership, and other stakeholders to develop of adaptive management plans that address climate change.

The following online references synthesize various agencies' efforts at understanding the potential impacts of climate change on natural resources in Washington State:

- University of Washington Climate Impacts Group. 2009. The Washington climate change impacts assessment: Evaluating Washington's future in a changing climate. <http://ces.washington.edu/cig/res/ia/waccia.shtml>
- University of Washington Climate Impacts Group. 2010. Hydrologic climate change scenarios for the Pacific Northwest Columbia River basin and coastal drainages. <http://www.hydro.washington.edu/2860/>
- Lawler, J.J. and M. Mathias. 2007. Climate change and the future of biodiversity in Washington. Report prepared for the Washington Biodiversity Council. <http://www.biodiversity.wa.gov/documents/WA-Climate-BiodiversityReport.pdf>
- National Wildlife Federation. 2009. Setting the stage: Ideas for safeguarding Washington's fish and wildlife in an era of climate change. [http://wdfw.wa.gov/wlm/cwcs/nwf\\_climatechange09.pdf](http://wdfw.wa.gov/wlm/cwcs/nwf_climatechange09.pdf)

For a comprehensive listing of resources regarding climate change impacts, preparation, and adaptation, see the Washington Department of Ecology website: [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/ipa\\_resources.htm](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/ipa_resources.htm).

#### **4. Protection of Ecosystem Functions**

An important element of recovering salmon in Puget Sound is the protection of existing habitat. Adequate protection of salmon habitat in Puget Sound continues to be an issue in all watersheds and continued degradation is noted throughout the area. While habitat restoration is relatively easy to implement by watersheds, given funding, protection of existing habitat is reliant on local regulations and their enforcement. Many regional policy drivers impact salmon habitat, including the Shoreline Management Act, Growth Management Act, National Marine Fisheries Service's Biological Opinion on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's implementation of the National Flood Insurance Program, and the Army Corps of Engineers' revised levee vegetation management policy. These regulations address many of society's concerns about the environment, but not necessarily salmon recovery first and foremost. Stakeholders in salmon recovery (e.g., the watershed groups, PSP, and RITT) need to develop ways to provide the technical input for integrating, to a greater extent, actions that promote salmon recovery into these local and regional decisions and regulations affecting salmon habitat.

## **Watershed Specific Technical Review: Hood Canal**

The Hood Canal 3-Year Implementation Priorities and Work Program lists habitat actions in areas used by Mid-Hood Canal and Skokomish River Chinook salmon populations, the Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon populations, as well as ESA-listed steelhead and bull trout. The matrix of actions and descriptive characteristics do not identify which of these species the actions are most likely to affect. The additional narrative provided by the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) focuses on the mid-Hood Canal region.

Although the project matrix also identifies projects associated with the Skokomish River where a final Skokomish River Chinook Recovery Plan is being finished, HCCC did not want pre-judge the outcome of those revisions. Because the RITT believes that it is unlikely that the general focus of habitat restoration in the draft Skokomish River Chinook Recovery Plan will change much in the final plan and because the project matrix focuses on habitat projects, we also reviewed these projects consistent with the draft plan.

***1. Are the suites of actions and top priorities identified in the watershed's three-year work plan/program consistent with the hypotheses and strategies identified in the Recovery Plan (Volume I and II of the Recovery Plan, NOAA supplement)?***

In general, the projects in both the mid-Hood Canal region and the Skokomish River region continue with the direction set in earlier three-year plans and the recovery plans. As noted in our comments for the past four years, habitat actions chosen for the work program followed the limiting factors analysis and were supported by some EDT analyses, especially in the mid-Hood Canal region. This provided consistency with actions and priorities of the recovery plans. In the Skokomish River where EDT or other watershed modeling is on-going some sequencing of habitat actions and locations of priority actions could change as salmon recovery planners refine their goals for the target population for recovery and as they improve understanding of the status of habitat and habitat forming processes. The projects, however, remain consistent with addressing limiting factors for the watershed identified in the 2007 draft recovery plan.

***2. Is the implementation of the salmon recovery plan on-track for achieving the 10-year goal(s)? If not, why not and what are the key priorities to move forward?***

This is difficult to answer conclusively. In mid-Hood Canal salmon recovery planners used 25 years rather than 10 years to model short-term outcomes. Although the 10-year horizon is about halfway to the 25 year planning horizon, it appears that implementation is not at a pace that might get to the anticipated short-term outcomes. Watershed planners identify several reasons for this. First, because many habitat projects and protections need to occur on private lands in the lower watersheds, landowner unwillingness to participate can slow progress. Second, inadequate capacity (people and funding) slows implementation of projects as well as efforts of people to build the kinds of relationships with landowners and provide the necessary education to move projects forward. Ten-year goals for the Skokomish River have not been finalized. However, significant planning work has been completed for restoration of flows and channel

structure in the North Fork of the Skokomish River through the implementation of the Settlement Agreement for the Cushman Hydroelectric Project made pursuant to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) regulations and the RITT was aware of these through their involvement in the Skokomish Recovery plan development. Other high priority projects in the South Fork of the Skokomish River, lower main stem, and estuary have been completed or are underway. Continuing to develop monitoring and benchmarks for evaluating pace and effectiveness of recovery would help these watersheds answer these questions.

***3. Is the sequencing and timing of actions appropriate for the current stage of implementation?***

This is difficult to judge. Overall, projects addressing the more significant limiting factors are proposed to be done first, although some lower priority projects are included because they are important for generating community support. The prioritization of the habitat projects in Mid-Hood Canal, which is used by both Chinook salmon and summer chum salmon as well as other species, was based on rankings from EDT analyses of mostly “in-stream” actions that if fixed would have a predicted biological benefit to the fish and a qualitative assessment of the likelihood of implementation. However, as noted in the HCCC narrative, opportunity associated with landowner willingness to participate constrains choice and sequencing of projects. A major sequencing issue, for example, is how to proceed with restoration of the Duckabush estuary without addressing the potential impacts of and to Highway 101. The projects listed for the Skokomish watershed range from upstream passage in the North Fork to modifying silviculture practices to restoration of the river and estuary. These appear consistent with the hypotheses linking habitat forming processes, land use, and limiting factors or habitat conditions in the draft Skokomish Recovery Plan. A key project identified in the matrix that will inform and drive sequence and prioritization of many projects especially in the lower river is Army Corp’s General Investigation. The increased focus this past year on habitat and flows in the North Fork through the Settlement Agreement is consistent with sequencing and prioritization in the draft recovery plan with the goal of reintroducing early-timed Chinook salmon to the stream.

***4. Does the three-year work plan/program reflect any new challenges or adaptive management needs that have arisen over the past year?***

Our comments here are the same as 2007 - 2009. No hatchery or harvest actions are listed and likewise H-integration appears to be missing. This is especially important because Chinook salmon in mid-Hood Canal have apparently not responded to implementation of the current suite of harvest, hatchery, and habitat actions. Abundances remain very low. Likewise, aggressive planned reintroduction of multiple species and life-histories of salmon in the Skokomish River will pose interesting H-integration challenges that would be best addressed by a well-designed adaptive management plan. Last year, we identified a major need in this region as completing and implementing an adaptive management plan and strategy that directly identifies key uncertainties and how to use existing and new knowledge to make effective decisions to recover salmon. Efforts to do this are underway through the HCCC and the development of the Skokomish Recovery Plan. The RITT intended to help with this priority in the last year but like many others was they were limited by time and resources. This remains a priority, however.

## II. Policy Review Comments

The Recovery Council Work Group, an interdisciplinary policy team made up of lead policy staff in federal, state, local agencies, as well as a lead policy staff representative from the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, evaluated each of the fourteen watershed work plans. In addressing their review questions, outlined above, the interdisciplinary team noted both general comments common to all watersheds within the region, as well as significant advancements and issues needing advancement that are watershed specific and need special attention. The general and watershed specific comments follow below.

### **Regional Policy Review: 2010 Three-Year Work Plan – Common Themes**

The region wants to call attention to the significant amount of work and effort that each of the watershed groups put into updating the three year work plan narratives and spreadsheets. Each year, the watershed groups build off of the previous year's reviews and information, incorporating this into the update. The watershed groups continue to demonstrate an increasing amount of sophistication in implementing the recovery plan, advancing strategically important projects by doing long-term planning, sequencing work, and ultimately prioritizing where funding is focused.

We look forward to continuing to work with watersheds to identify and facilitate high priority projects to move forward and to refine the process and three year work plans.

#### Adaptive Management and Monitoring

Advancing monitoring and adaptive management remains a high priority both regionally and at the watershed scale. The majority of watersheds continue to indicate that this is a significant, 'next big challenge' in their areas. The NOAA Supplement has identified this gap in the Recovery Plan as a critical weakness. As part of the approval process, NOAA indicated that developing this plan was a requirement.

A coordinated monitoring and adaptive management framework that supports refinement at both the regional and watershed scales is critical to understand the pace and effectiveness of recovery actions. This framework and the resulting programs need to support an integrated approach to recovery implementation tracking, incorporate uncertainties around climate change, and develop or refine recovery plan goals where needed.

The region continues to be committed to supporting watersheds in advancing their efforts to develop and implement a monitoring and adaptive management plan in a way that acknowledges the interaction across habitat, harvest, hatchery, and hydropower management decisions. At the regional scale, several actions have been initiated to advance adaptive management, including:

1. RITT guidance on monitoring and adaptive management
2. RITT/PSP template for monitoring and adaptive management that builds a framework within which each watershed that can connect their monitoring information to other watersheds and the ESU.



3. RITT/PSP coordinated approach to support the development/advancement of monitoring and adaptive management programs in each watershed chapter area.

Significant resources are and will continue to be needed to support involvement in the development of these programs across the Puget Sound and then in the implementation of the programs via focused monitoring funds. Resources need to include having involvement from all sectors of salmon recovery working together: hatchery, harvest, habitat protection, habitat restoration, and hydropower.

#### Protecting Ecosystem Functions

Preserving options and addressing threats are critical components of recovery implementation both at the local and regional scale. Recovering salmon in Puget Sound requires effective regulatory protection of existing habitat, along with acquisition, incentives, and education and outreach programs around existing land uses. The protection of habitat through these and other approaches remains a high priority.

At this time, there are several opportunities to strengthen the nexus between habitat protection, salmon recovery, and different regulatory mechanisms.

- *Shoreline Master Programs and Critical Area Ordinances*: Local jurisdictions across the Puget Sound are working to update their shoreline master programs, through the Shoreline Management Act, and their critical areas ordinances, through the Growth Management Act. These two regulatory programs are critically important to our collective ability to protect and manage habitat since they address the management of riverine and marine shorelines, streams, wetlands, water recharge zones, and other ecologically important habitats for salmon. There is a strong need to incorporate existing information from the salmon recovery plan and implementation efforts into these regulatory updates in order to strengthen the relationship between land use management and the needs of salmon. Although the watershed groups are not the empowered entity for leading the effort to incorporate information from the salmon plan into the regulatory update, it is the responsibility of everyone involved to support local jurisdictions in adopting the regulations necessary to preserve recovery options for the future. This includes making information accessible as well as understandable within a regulatory context.
- *FEMA's National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)*: NOAA recently issued a Biological Opinion on FEMA's NFIP, concluding that the program jeopardizes and adversely modifies designated critical habitat for salmon recovery. Since this decision in 2009, there has been a significant amount of concern and conversation about how to respond. Local jurisdictions, along with FEMA, NOAA, PSP, and others, are working to identify a clear path forward for protecting floodplains in terms of ecosystem recovery and human health and well-being. Implementation of an agreed-upon approach to limit the impacts of development in the floodplain will require additional resources at the local and state level and need to be tracked as part of understanding the status of salmon recovery efforts.
- *Army Corps of Engineers Levee Vegetation Management Policy*: A significant amount of riparian habitat sits on top of levees within the floodplains and deltas of the Puget Sound. The Corps' policy requires the removal of vegetation over two inches in diameter. This

new levee vegetation management policy removes significant amounts of vegetation, which provide salmon habitat in already degraded riparian areas. A regional response to this policy is underway and important to continue to support in order to reduce the negative impact for salmon recovery. Numerous entities, including state agencies, local governments, non-profits, tribes, and the Puget Sound Partnership, sent a letter to the Corps urging that this policy be changed to allow for retention of more trees on levees.

Additionally, there are non-regulatory mechanisms that are timely. This includes:

- *Education and Outreach:* Many of the watersheds identified education and outreach programs as an element of their work plans. Working with the public to advance a comprehensive understanding and individual actions associated with recovery is critically important. Advancing programs across the watersheds and that are mutually supportive within the watersheds will help strengthen the effort.
- *Nearshore Technical Assistance:* protection of the nearshore remains a high priority for salmon recovery across the Puget Sound. There are emerging tools and resources available, including technical work from the General Investigation for the Puget Sound nearshore, the monitoring and adaptive management template, and watershed-based prioritization approaches for nearshore. Continuing to advance the thinking around fish utilization and critical nearshore habitats will support a refined approach to protection and balancing different uses along the nearshore.

#### Focus on salmon recovery

Salmon recovery implementers continue to be pulled in many directions by other mandates. The Puget Sound Partnership and the Policy Work Group recognize that implementation of salmon recovery actions remains a high priority. Maintaining a focus on the priorities in the salmon recovery plan, as described in each watershed chapter plan, will be increasingly challenging, and will require a continued investment of time, resources and support.

#### Funding

Establishing consistent, reliable funding for capital and non-capital projects to implement the recovery plan chapters continues to be a challenge. It is critically important to fund implementation of the plan, at an adequate level, in order to keep the momentum and focus on recovery. Lack of capacity across member organizations of watershed groups remains a significant limiting factor for advancing recovery objectives. The advancement of H-integration and adaptive management objectives, in particular, call for continued funding to support ongoing coordination and participation.

#### Balancing Land Uses

The Puget Sound Partnership funded a report, *Obstacles to Implementing Important Capital Project for Salmon Recovery* (Blackmore Consulting, 08/27/09), to identify obstacles for implementing habitat restoration for salmon recovery around the Puget Sound. The report identified the following key obstacles that continue to be a challenge and require significant regional and local resources:

- Balancing working lands, primarily agriculture and working forests, with salmon recovery. This is especially important in the estuaries where both working agriculture and salmon restoration is located.

- Supporting a decision-making approach that incorporates salmon recovery needs, based on the plan, into decisions at the federal, state, and local scale. This is often difficult due to variable politics and community support but ultimately has a significant impact on our collective ability to complete capital projects on pace to achieve recovery goals

### **Watershed Specific Policy Review: Hood Canal**

#### *Significant Improvements:*

- Promotion, leadership and consistent use of Habitat Work Schedule (HWS)
- Integrating salmon recovery efforts and adaptive management with broader ecosystem recovery and management through the development of the Hood Canal Integrated Watershed Plan
- Near completion and review of the Skokomish Salmon Recovery Plan
- Habitat restoration continues to be strategic and advances with a variety and complexity of projects addressing riparian and estuarine habitats

#### *Issues to Advance:*

- Continue working with landowners to achieve long term conservation benefits
- Addressing impacts of logging roads and sedimentation loads, climate change and constrictions caused by Highway 101
- Finalize and implement the Skokomish Salmon Recovery Plan
- Finalize and implement critical pieces of the Hood Canal Integrated Watershed Plan, especially as they pertain to and integrate salmon recovery (Mid-Hood Canal Chinook, Skokomish Chinook, Hood Canal summer chum, H-integration)

#### *General:*

- The Hood Canal continues to implement significant conservation work that addresses the mid-Canal Chinook salmon population, including riparian and estuarine protection and restoration projects. This is an effective Lead Entity that includes a suite of projects to meet their goals.
- This area continues to be a leader in salmon and ecosystem recovery

#### Watershed Questions

Materials: Recovery Plan chapters, 2007, 2008, & 2009 three-year work plan updates and reviews, and 2010 three-year work plan updates

1. *Consistency question:* Are the suites of actions and top priorities identified in the watershed's three-year work plan/program consistent with the needs identified in the Recovery Chapter (Volume I and II of the Recovery Plan, NOAA supplement)? Are the suites of actions and top priorities identified in the watershed's three-year work plan/program consistent with the Action Agenda?
  - The programs are consistent with the Hood Canal chapter of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan

- Projects are also consistent with the Action Agenda as they seek to protect and restore ecosystem structure and function
2. *Pace/Status question:* Is implementation of salmon recovery on-track for achieving the 10-year goals?
    - Steady progress is being made, but it is slow
    - Much of what was outlined in the high implementation category for 10-year goals has been achieved or can be achieved with increased funding
    - Low funding, landowner issues, and capacity contribute to not meeting 10 year goals
  3. *What is needed question:* What type of support is needed to help support this watershed in achieving its recovery chapter goals? Are there any changes needed in the suites of actions to achieve the watershed's recovery chapter goals?
    - Actions appear to be consistent with achieving recovery
    - Limiting factors are funding, capacity, and landowner cooperation
    - Achieving recovery will take implementing the Skokomish Salmon Recovery Plan and integrating salmon and ecosystem protection and recovery projects
  4. *Next big challenge question:* Does the three-year work program reflect any new challenges or adaptive management needs that have arisen over the past year either within the watershed or across the region?
    - There are no new challenges (other than climate change) except those mentioned above