

APPENDIX F

Lead Entity Habitat Protection and Restoration Strategy

APPENDIX F: LEAD ENTITY HABITAT PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STRATEGY

The Snake River Lead Entity is an integral component of the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board. The Lead Entity is comprised of two citizen members from the four counties that make up the region. In addition, the Lead Entity is represented by a member from the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the United States Forest Service and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Collectively the citizens and technical members form the regional Lead Entity. The role of the Lead Entity is to review, score and rank projects at the regional scale consistent with the regional recovery plan and community values for consideration by the regional recovery board. The recovery board has final authority on the ranked order of projects submitted by the Lead Entity. The Lead Entity annually develops a process for review, scoring and ranking of projects and utilizes a scorecard (scoring criteria) for assessing consistency of each project with the regional recovery plan. See Table F-1 for a blank example of the scorecard. The Lead Entity By-laws are available upon request by contacting the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board/Lead Entity at info@snakeriverboard.org

The regional recovery plan is based on technical categories (priority areas and actions) and does not take into consideration community issues when funding allocations are made across watersheds. The recovery plan is an investment guidance document based on the viable salmonid population parameters including spatial structure, diversity, abundance and productivity. These technical criteria are solely based on fish biology and were used to prioritize areas and actions. The process to allocate funding was therefore purely technical and relied on project ratings (scores) for the VSP parameters of abundance, spatial structure and productivity. The process was to develop project scorecards that were structured to award more points to projects that immediately address an imminent threat and those that (1) are in priority areas (MSA's), (2) address factors affecting productivity (priority actions), (3) certainty of project, (4) project size and (5) project benefit relative to cost. The citizen and technical committee review each project and score them based on those five criteria. The scores are then arranged in descending order placing the highest scoring project at the top of the list and the lowest scoring project at the bottom.

The Lead Entity is comprised of a citizen committee and a technical committee that function jointly. To provide a more independent technical review of projects the regional technical team is used to review project applications and to provide comments to the regional board and Lead Entity committee. Further, the RTT members are invited to participate in the project review, scoring and ranking meeting convened by the Lead Entity. In addition, the project scoring criteria (scorecard) was reviewed by members of the RTT to be certain that the criteria and point allocations for the various categories are consistent with the regional recovery plan.

The technical team comments are reflected in the final project applications. The two technical review teams are used in the process are the Lead Entity technical team and the regional recovery board's regional technical team (RTT). The RTT is used to evaluate the projects based on the project proposals and then they provide their comments to the Lead Entity and recovery board prior to project scoring. The RTT also is invited to participate in the Lead Entity committee scoring meeting to address questions/comments. The RTT is comprised of the following individuals and organizations:

Gary James	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Bill Neve	DOE
Carmen Andonaegui	WDFW
Chris Pinney	ACOE

Dave Karl	WDFW
Del Groat	USFS
Emmit Taylor	Nez Perce Tribe
Glen Mendel	WDFW
Jason Flory	USFWS
Jed Volkman	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Jesse Schwartz	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Kate Terrell	USFWS
Matt Ranjus	WWCWP
Paul Kraynak	Nez Perce Tribe
Steve Rodgers	WDFW

This team is used to provide a first-screen review of potential project ideas in a “pre-application meeting” along with the SRFB review panel. This team guides development of the scoring criteria to ensure that the outcome of project scoring is a prioritized list reflective of regional priorities. This team is most familiar with VSP and recovery strategies. This team is very inclusive and familiar with “typical” project costs and outcomes and served early on to help redirect inconsistent projects or those that are not fully developed to other sources or to future grant rounds.

To ensure consistency of the project list with the regional recovery plan and priorities the Lead Entity worked with the RTT to develop project scoring criteria based off the priority areas and actions in the recovery plan. The project evaluation and ranking process relies heavily on this empirical/analytical approach to develop a ranked project list. The result of this process is intended to be a list of projects consistent with the recovery plan priorities.

The regional recovery board considers the priorities and recommendations by the Lead Entity and may accept those recommendations without change or change them based on social, technical or other considerations.

Table F-1 Example Scorecard

Snake River Lead Entity *Project Evaluation Criteria* - 2006

Project Title _____

Total Project Cost \$\$

SRFB Request \$\$

Project Location: _____

Is the Project in the right area?

Project Tier	Points Possible	Description (applications that contain multiple project sites that are not all in the same priority area will be averaged based on each site location)
Tier I	50	Imminent threats. Habitat project(s) in an MSA and within a priority restoration/protection reach; assessments in this category score 25 points
Tier II	40	Project(s) in an MSA but not in a priority reach; assessments in this category score 20 points
Tier III	30	Projects in an mSA and within a priority protection reach; assessments in this project category score 15 points
Tier IV	20	Project(s) in an mSA but not in a priority reach; assessments in this category score 10 points
Tier V	10	Project(s) not in an mSA; assessments in this category score 5 points.

Score

Habitat Factors Addressed: _____

How well is the project addressing limiting factors?

Project Tier	Points Possible	Description
Tier I	23 to 30	Project addresses an Imminent threat (dead fish observed at site) OR project that addresses 3 or more of the priority habitat factors listed in Table 14 for the identified MSA.
	20 to 22	Project is presumed to address an imminent threat (because it does not meet a NOAA or other ESA criteria) listed on Table 14 ; fish must use site
Tier II	11 to 20	Project(s) in an MSA that address 2 of the priority habitat factors listed in Table 14. Projects that are in an mSA and address two or more of the following protection strategies: upland, riparian and water conservation.
Tier III	0 to 10	Project(s) in an MSA that address 1 of the priority habitat factors listed in Table 14. Projects that are in an mSA and address one of the following protection strategies: upland, riparian or water conservation.

Score

Project Certainty

Will the project work?

Points Possible	Description
11 to 20	Project/assessment is based on proven scientific methods and will meet the intended objectives.
1 to 10	Project/assessment is based on unproven methods but will likely meet its intended objectives.
0	Project/assessment is based on proven scientific methods but will not likely meet intended objectives OR is based on speculative methods and will not likely meet its intended objectives

Score

Project Size
Sufficient to make

Project Type	Points Possible	Description
		This section is to reward projects that are large and address multiple ubiquitous limiting factors; the points are additive to points received on page 1 and are additive across project types

Riparian	10	>50 acres	
	6 to 9	25-49 acres	
	3 to 5	10-24 acres	
	2	<10 acres	
			Score _____
Instream Flow (during fish critical period)	10	>2 CFS	
	6 to 9	>1 but < 2 CFS	
	3 to 5	>0.5 but <1 CFS	
	1 or 2	<0.5 CFS	
			Score _____
Instream Habitat OR useable habitat opened	10	>1,000 lineal feet	
	6 to 9	500 to 999 feet	
	3 to 5	200 to 499 feet	
	1 or 2	< 200 feet	
			Score _____
Upland Best Management Practices	10	> 200 acres	
	6 to 9	100 to 199 acres	
	3 to 5	50 to 99 acres	
	1 or 2	< 50 acres	
			Score _____
Assessments must either lead to a project or fill an identified data gap	35	Assessment of an imminent threat (fish passage barrier, screen, ford, de-watered reach) that will directly lead to a project	
	25	Assessment to address a level 4 critical uncertainty (data gap) as reported in Section 6 (Tables 6-2 thru 6-6) of the Regional Recovery Plan	
	20	Assessment to address a level 3 critical uncertainty (data gap) as reported in Section 6 (Tables 6-2 thru 6-6) of the Regional Recovery Plan.	
	10	Assessment to address a critical uncertainty (data gap) of level 1 or 2 as reported in Section 6 (Tables 6-2 thru 6-6) of the Regional Recovery Plan.	
	10	Assessment of public interest in habitat protection or restoration projects.	
			Score _____
Cost/Benefit	up to 10	Committee may assign up to 10 points for cost:benefit relationship based on community values, past experience with project costs, cost-share, perceived project value relative to other proposed projects, number of ESA listed species and other considerations. <i>Justification of the points allocated will need to be documented by Committee at the time of project scoring and will be made available upon request.</i>	
			Score _____
			Total Project Score _____
Lead Entity Committee Member's Signature _____			