

# ATTACHMENT 4 - LEAD ENTITY STRATEGIES AND LISTS - REVIEW PANEL EVALUATIONS

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor County**

<b>Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy<sup>1</sup></b>
<p><b>1. Species and stocks</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?</li> <li>• Is the status of each stock presented?</li> <li>• Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Excellent<sup>2</sup></b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Good</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Fair</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Poor</b></p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>The strategy provides excellent information stocks although the status of many stocks is unknown. Stocks are prioritized based on status using a rational approach. The strategy indicates stock status as a rating criteria (a rating sheet could not be located in the materials reviewed).</i></p>
<p><b>2. Watershed and marine ecological processes</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Excellent<sup>3</sup></b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Good</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Fair</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Poor</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

<sup>2</sup> The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>3</sup> The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The lead entity continues to make improvements in their identification and prioritization of watershed processes by sub-basin. New watershed profiles of the Satsop and Chehalis have been added to the strategy, but they are still fairly general. The use of a basin profile along with an actions and areas table makes for a more complete story with context for the actions proposed. The lead entity could expand the profiles to discuss more of what they know of processes and give some indication of where restoration and protection should start.*

*The connection between processes and limiting factors is included and rational. The strategy indicates that projects that address limiting factors and processes will be promoted.*

**3. Habitat features**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

**Rating:** \_\_\_Excellent<sup>4</sup>   **X**  Good \_\_\_Fair \_\_\_Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The new basin tables for Satsop and Chehalis are a great start on identifying and connecting limiting habitat factors to stocks. It is unclear if the habitat features are prioritized in the basin tables. It would help to continue to make connections of limiting factors with fish needs by life stage. This should also help with prioritization. For example, the lead entity could identify what the key life stage issue is for a species (e.g., abundance of spawning habitat limited by fine sediment deposition). Therefore, they could identify where good quality spawning habitat needs to be protected or provided access, and key spawning areas need to be restored.*

*It is not clear what happened to the other basin action lists seen in the strategy in the past. It is not clear if the lead entity intends to retain these in the strategy until new tables and profiles are completed.*

<sup>4</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

#### 4. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_Excellent<sup>5</sup>      X  Good    \_\_\_\_\_Fair    \_\_\_\_\_Poor

#### Narrative (rationale for rating):

*Prioritization of actions is provided through a two-tiered approach. Actions are identified and prioritized at the sub-basin scale. Barrier surveys are available this year and are more site-specific.*

#### 5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_Excellent<sup>6</sup>    \_\_\_\_\_Good      X  Fair    \_\_\_\_\_Poor

<sup>5</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>6</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*There were no significant changes to the strategy in this category from last year.*

*The community outreach and strategy to address the highest priority biological needs is not focused or specific. However, the efforts of the lead entity to improve the watershed process/habitat connections via their TAG/CAG is laudable as well as the coordination efforts to explore development of efforts across the Coastal salmon recovery region.*

**5. Certainty**

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

**Rating:**    \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>7</sup>      X   Good      X   Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Certainty increases as new information is incorporated into the strategy and connections are made between watershed processes, limiting factors and prioritized stocks.*

*The strategy is based primarily on LFA and best professional opinion. EDT was not updated but reviewed for consistency.*

*The lead entity has requested support to update EDT.*

**Fit of the Project List to the Strategy**

**7. Actions and geographic areas**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>8</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The three projects on the list are within a High priority subbasin (Satsop), and all are treating an identified Tier 1 action.*

<sup>7</sup> In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<sup>8</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

### ***8. Fit of project ranking***

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>9</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

#### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The lead entity has improved the specificity of actions related to watershed processes and habitat factors in different sub-basins and areas of the Satsop and Chehalis mainstem. However, the scale is still very coarse for deciding priorities within a basin. As all of the projects are within the Satsop basin there is insufficient information to know how the projects should be ranked beyond their ranking through the scoring mechanism.*

*Based on the scoring system the projects are in the correct order.*

### **ADDITIONAL NOTES:**

*The lead entity is actively involved in discussions about of regionalization in the coastal salmon recovery region.*

---

<sup>9</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

## SRFB 2006 (7<sup>th</sup>) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Klickitat County**

<b>Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy<sup>10</sup></b>
<p><b>1. <i>Species and stocks</i></b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?</li> <li>• Is the status of each stock presented?</li> <li>• Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Excellent<sup>11</sup></b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Good</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Fair</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Poor</b></p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>Species are prioritized into three tiers by sub-watershed. Tier 1 includes ESA-listed species and native stocks with high cultural significance. Where recovery goals are set, recovery goals are discussed by stock in the sub-watersheds. Tier 1 species receive greater number of points in scoring. The explanation of stocks, status, and prioritization by Tiers 1-3 is clear.</i></p>
<p><b>2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i></b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Excellent<sup>12</sup></b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Good</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Fair</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Poor</b></p>

<sup>10</sup> See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

<sup>11</sup> The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>12</sup> The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The lead entity continues to add information on watershed processes into their matrix as it becomes available. A short discussion of watershed processes and priority limiting factors in the sub-basin profiles and additional sub-watershed profiles would be a good mechanism for setting the context of watershed processes by sub-watershed.*

*The review panel recommends that they continue with identification of causal mechanisms for habitat factors, such as how sources of LWD are limited (e.g., White Creek drainage of Klickitat).*

*Habitat features and watershed processes are mixed in presentation, although their relationships appear to be fairly logical. There appears to be some lack of understanding of definition of watershed processes.*

**3. Habitat features**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

**Rating:**      X   **Excellent**<sup>13</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Habitat features are well listed by reach and are prioritized, but mixed with processes.*

**4. Actions and geographic areas**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

**Rating:**      X   **Excellent**<sup>14</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

<sup>13</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>14</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The actions and areas matrix clearly identifies actions within the prioritized watersheds and reaches. These actions are supported by heavy weighting in the ranking criteria. The actions are themselves prioritized and where possible the links to habitat and salmonid life stage are delineated. There appears to be continued improvement in documenting supporting data and rationale for the actions. Some priority areas have greater specificity of actions, which may be due to varying levels of available information. There appears to be an active effort to recruit sponsors to address the highest priority actions.*

**5. Community issues**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>15</sup>      X   Good         Fair         Poor

<sup>15</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The matrix (attachment A) specifically identifies supporting and limiting community interests by limiting factor/action, and then project sponsor needs to address these within proposals. Scoring is tied to how well they address the community interests. Main community issues factors are identified for the A priority areas with specific information about the factors and some actions to address them.*

*Ratings specifically relate to community issues and taking action on them.*

*The extent to which the lead entity has broadened outreach and involvement by all aspects of the community (e.g., Yakama Nation) is not clear.*

**6. Certainty**

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

**Rating:**      \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>16</sup>        X   Good        X   Fair      \_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Elements of uncertainty were identified. Several geographic areas appear to have lower priority due to uncertainty, lack of information, or uncertainty regarding issues or actions affecting the recovery of the area.*

*Modeling work is still not reflected in the strategy.*

*The lead entity continues to improve documentation and use of supporting data and rationale for the strategy. Some priority areas have greater specificity of actions that may be due to varying levels of available information.*

**Fit of the Project List to the Strategy**

**7. Actions and geographic areas**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

**Rating:**        X   Excellent<sup>17</sup>      \_\_\_ Good      \_\_\_ Fair      \_\_\_ Poor

<sup>16</sup> In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<sup>17</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Of the two projects on the list, the first project is Phase 2 of existing funded project in Upper Klickitat which is an A priority Area, has Tier 1 stocks, and addresses a priority action and community outreach on restoration.*

*The second project is also an A priority and a high priority data gap with proposed design options. Community issues weighed heavily on the scoring for this project.*

*Projects address high priority areas and actions in the strategy. (There was some concern expressed from the community that was not addressed in the strategy related to the certainty of control of invasive species.)*

**8. Fit of project ranking**

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>18</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The two projects are in the appropriate rank order.*

*Ranking differences were primarily based on certainty and community issues. The second project has some uncertainty on the ability to prevent mudsnail establishment or eradication, and there was some concern regarding use of scarce funds for this, given the nature of invasive species issues. The result is a slightly lower ranked project than the other as they are both in A priority watersheds and addressing A priority actions.*

**ADDITIONAL NOTES:**

*This lead entity is not involved in recovery planning within the Mid-Columbia salmon recovery region. NOAA is drafting a recovery plan that covers this area, and the lead entity was not clear about how that plan might relate to future potential revisions of the lead entity strategy.*

<sup>18</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

## SRFB 2006 (7<sup>th</sup>) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Pacific County**

<b>Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy<sup>19</sup></b>
<p><b>1. Species and stocks</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?</li> <li>• Is the status of each stock presented?</li> <li>• Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    ___ Excellent<sup>20</sup>    <u>  X  </u> Good    ___ Fair    ___ Poor</p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>Salmonid species, stocks and their status are clearly identified, but are not prioritized. More species present results in a higher rating.</i></p>
<p><b>2. Watershed and marine ecological processes</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    ___ Excellent<sup>21</sup>    ___ Good    <u>  X  </u> Fair    ___ Poor</p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>The strategy summary did not specifically respond to the questions in this rating section.</i></p> <p><i>Watershed processes were discussed in a general way for the area, but the information does not translate to sub-watersheds.</i></p>

<sup>19</sup> See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

<sup>20</sup> The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>21</sup> The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

### 3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>22</sup> **X** **Good** \_\_\_ Fair \_\_\_ Poor

#### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Limiting factors were identified and prioritized at the sub-basin scale, but they were not specifically prioritized in the strategy.*

### 4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>23</sup> **X** **Good** **X** **Fair** \_\_\_ Poor

#### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Changes were made to the strategy this year to clearly prioritize between sub-watersheds and provide a general indication of priority for lower reaches of the watersheds due to the presence of multiple species. However, this rationale may not support the actions needed for improvement of watershed conditions for the targeted species.*

*Specific actions and priority areas were only generally identified for most of the basins except the Nemah and Naselle.*

*Completed barrier surveys were included.*

*Broad priorities were supported by the ranking system.*

<sup>22</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>23</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

## 5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_Excellent<sup>24</sup> \_\_\_\_\_Good \_\_\_\_\_**X**\_\_\_\_\_Fair \_\_\_\_\_Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The lead entity relies heavily on the Coordinating Council to bring community issues to the table. No strategic planning efforts were noted to discover or address any existing community issues other than via the composition of the WBWRCC.*

*One improvement in the evaluation system that relates to community issues is the update of the rating system for the projects.*

*Major issues or impediments to salmon recovery are identified for the lead entity, but are not prioritized and specific actions to address these issues are not identified.*

*The lead entity has been working on coordinating efforts within the Coastal salmon recovery region.*

---

<sup>24</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

## 7. *Certainty*

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

**Rating:**    \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>25</sup>    \_\_\_ Good      X   Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Strategy goals remain very broad; watershed assessments are incomplete; specific prioritized actions are scant.*

## **Fit of the Project List to the Strategy**

### **7. *Actions and geographic areas***

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>26</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The one project on the project list is located in the Lower Naselle basin, which is one of two Tier 1 watersheds in the lead entity area. The feasibility study is located in the lower basin. The scoring criteria clearly rank the lower basin as priority due to the multi-species approach of the strategy. It addresses limiting factors for access and rearing habitat.*

<sup>25</sup> In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<sup>26</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

### ***8. Fit of project ranking***

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_Excellent<sup>27</sup> \_\_\_\_\_Good \_\_\_\_\_Fair \_\_\_\_\_Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Not applicable. There is only one project on the list.*

### **ADDITIONAL NOTES:**

*The lead entity is actively involved in a discussion of regionalization in the coastal salmon recovery region.*

---

<sup>27</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

## SRFB 2006 (7<sup>th</sup>) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Pend Oreille**

<b>Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy<sup>28</sup></b>
<p><b>1. <i>Species and stocks</i></b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?</li> <li>• Is the status of each stock presented?</li> <li>• Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <u>  X  </u> Excellent<sup>29</sup>    ___ Good    ___ Fair    ___ Poor</p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>Species and stocks are clearly identified and prioritized with a clear rationale and are supported in the ranking criteria.</i></p>
<p><b>2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i></b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    ___ Excellent<sup>30</sup>    ___ Good    ___ Fair    <u>  X  </u> Poor</p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>The lead entity clearly states they have not done a watershed processes analysis and have identified it as a WRIA wide assessment action. However, they do include some discussion of watershed processes within the habitat and watershed conditions summaries of the sub-basins.</i></p>

<sup>28</sup> See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

<sup>29</sup> The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>30</sup> The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

### 3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_ Excellent<sup>31</sup>      **X**   **Good**    \_\_\_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The lead entity identified a suite of priority habitat limiting factors affecting bull trout in the Pend Oreille and then ranked limiting factors by sub-basin in order to reflect different land use history and habitat conditions.*

### 4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_   **X**   **Excellent**<sup>32</sup>    \_\_\_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Clear prioritization of actions and areas by sub-basin with specific actions in some sub-basins; could be improved with more specificity. It would be useful to explain in the strategy why there are not proposed actions in the highest priority areas (e.g., the Salmo sub-basin).*

<sup>31</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>32</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

## 5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>33</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Continued efforts at addressing community issues through surveys and development of actions to address the issues shows strategic thinking.*

*The overall approach is excellent, clearly identifies priority community issues and those that clearly lack community support. Community issues, whether supported or unsupported, are identified for the priority actions. Highest priority actions with perceived low support become the priorities for community action. Appears not much progress has been made since 2005, particularly with respect to incorporating results of the streamfront landowner survey into the strategy and tables.*

*General outreach actions were identified.*

*It appears that the Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) evaluation criteria in Appendix E include scoring that was already rated by the TAG (e.g., priorities associated with limiting factors, actions, species, and areas). This approach appears to create duplication across some aspects of CAG and TAG ratings. For example, this appears to require the CAG to be fully informed of technical (TAG) information and ratings. This approach is confusing. Appears to rely on technical knowledge and/or education by CAG to be an accurate reflection of projects.*

<sup>33</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

## 8. *Certainty*

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

**Rating:**    \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>34</sup>      X   Good      X   Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*New this year was the prioritized barrier survey information that was included in Appendix E.*

*Completion of the watershed processes analysis should greatly improve certainty.*

*A finer scale ranking of sub-basins would aid focus for restoration work. For example, tributaries to Le Clerc creek are perceived as high priority, but they may be so far from priority needs within the area that certain actions here may have limited benefit.*

## **Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan**

### **7. *Actions and geographic areas***

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>35</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*All three projects on the list are in high priority areas. Project actions are the highest unfunded priority for the sub-basins.*

*Projects are in 6<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> high priority sub-basins, and target fairly high priority actions particularly in the first two projects – barrier removals.*

*It would help to clarify why projects are not forthcoming from the top 5 high priority sub-basins.*

<sup>34</sup> In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<sup>35</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

### ***8. Fit of project ranking***

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

**Rating:**      X   Excellent<sup>36</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

#### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The three projects are appropriately ranked based on the strategy.*

*Projects accurately reflect geographic, action and limiting factor priorities. Projects ranked according to scores. Scores only differ in priority for the first two projects.*

*The strategy identifies removal of non-native species as high priority action, but these were deemed to be outside the scope of the SRFB funding and the project list does not include those projects.*

#### **ADDITIONAL NOTES:**

*The lead entity is involved in an effort to explore its relationship to the Northeast salmon recovery region.*

*The lead entity strategy and project list are aimed at the priorities in the current USFWS bull trout recovery plan.*

---

<sup>36</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

## SRFB 2006 (7<sup>th</sup>) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**

<b>Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy<sup>37</sup></b>
<p><b>1. <i>Species and stocks</i></b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?</li> <li>• Is the status of each stock presented?</li> <li>• Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <u>  <b>X</b>  </u> <b>Excellent</b><sup>38</sup>    <u>      </u> <b>Good</b>    <u>      </u> <b>Fair</b>    <u>      </u> <b>Poor</b></p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>Stocks and their status are identified and are prioritized rationally.</i></p> <p><i>Species are prioritized by basin and two basins have priority over the others.</i></p> <p><i>Priorities are supported by ranking criteria.</i></p>
<p><b>2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i></b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <u>      </u> <b>Excellent</b><sup>39</sup>    <u>      </u> <b>Good</b>    <u>  <b>X</b>  </u> <b>Fair</b>    <u>      </u> <b>Poor</b></p>

<sup>37</sup> See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

<sup>38</sup> The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>39</sup> The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Discussion of processes in the strategy has been improved somewhat with inclusion of basic rationale. Priority limiting processes are identified for the basins and the habitat connection is identified. There is no discussion of the processes, causal mechanisms, basin history and the connections to habitat and fish.*

*Ranking criteria appear to support the priorities.*

**3. Habitat features**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

**Rating:**    \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>40</sup>      **X**   **Good**    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Habitat features are identified at a coarse level and are generally the same across watersheds.*

*Habitat limiting factors are identified by basin and prioritized through their connection to identified watershed processes. Key areas that are affected by these limiting factors are identified but not prioritized.*

**4. Actions and geographic areas**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

**Rating:**    \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>41</sup>    \_\_\_ Good      **X**   **Fair**    \_\_\_ Poor

<sup>40</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>41</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*There was no significant change in this part of the strategy from last year.*

*Two basins are prioritized over the others based on size (surrogate for production potential) and species presence. Areas affected by limiting factors are identified within the sub-basin, but not prioritized. General actions related to the limiting factors are identified, but they are only prioritized based on if they are connected to the high or medium priority factor. Specificity is lacking, and there are no geographically identified actions below the sub-basin scale.*

**5. Community issues**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

**Rating:**    \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>42</sup>    \_\_\_ Good      X   Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*No changes in this rating category were noted this year beyond the participation with other lead entities in the development of an approach to the Coastal salmon recovery region.*

<sup>42</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

## 9. *Certainty*

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

**Rating:** \_\_\_Excellent<sup>43</sup> \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Fair **\_\_X\_\_**Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*No changes were noted from last year.*

*The stated basis for the strategy is LFA but it appears the strategy does not clearly or fully utilize LFA or other available information. No modeling was utilized.*

## **Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan**

### **7. *Actions and geographic areas***

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

**Rating:** \_\_\_Excellent<sup>44</sup> \_\_\_Good **\_\_X\_\_**Fair \_\_\_Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*There were two projects on the list.*

*The Prairie Creek (knotweed) project is a medium priority action but is rated as first on the list.*

*Both projects are within a high priority area and relate to medium priority processes identified basin wide. The limited specificity of the process/habitat information makes it difficult to see whether these are the most beneficial projects in these places at this time.*

<sup>43</sup> In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<sup>44</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

### ***8. Fit of project ranking***

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_Excellent<sup>45</sup> \_\_\_\_\_Good   **X**  Fair \_\_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_\_Poor

#### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Limited information was provided to support the project ranking. It is not clear how scores support the rank order of the projects. The Citizen Committee reversed the order of the projects as ranked by the technical review group.*

*Both projects are the types of actions identified in the Quinalt strategy, but the knotweed project is not clearly identified in the strategy. It appears to fit under "Riparian Function" - loss of riparian area, which is a medium priority process versus the road relocation project, which addresses a high priority process.*

### **ADDITIONAL NOTES:**

*The lead entity is actively involved in a discussion of regionalization in the coastal salmon recovery region.*

---

<sup>45</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

## SRFB 2006 (7<sup>th</sup>) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **WRIA 20**

<b>Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy<sup>46</sup></b>
<p><b>1. Species and stocks</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?</li> <li>• Is the status of each stock presented?</li> <li>• Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Excellent<sup>47</sup></b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Good</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Fair</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Poor</b></p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>Species (ESUs/DPSs) and stocks are identified and SaSI status is noted. Priority stocks are listed ESUs and DPSs, Watersheds are prioritized into four tiers based on the presence of these stocks.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically for WRIA 20, stocks are prioritized by basin depending on their productivity, but prioritization information is only found on watershed pages. The watershed pages were not provided for review by the review panel.</i></p>
<p><b>2. Watershed and marine ecological processes</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Excellent<sup>48</sup></b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Good</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Fair</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Poor</b></p>

<sup>46</sup> See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

<sup>47</sup> The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>48</sup> The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>No changes to the NOPL strategy used by WRIA 20 occurred from last year (processes are identified at the watershed scale, and not specific at the sub-basin or reach scales). A discussion of watershed processes and their connection to habitat is provided within the watershed pages (but no watershed pages were evident for other than the Quillayute and Calawah), but it lacks specificity and connections to fish life stages.</i></p>
<p><b>3. Habitat features</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    ___ Excellent<sup>49</sup>    <u>  X  </u> Good    ___ Fair    ___ Poor</p>
<p><b>Narrative (rationale for rating):</b></p> <p><i>No changes noted from last year. A discussion of habitat limiting factors and their connection to fish is provided within the watershed pages. Priorities are based on a publication by Roni et al. and not necessarily on local information for the watershed.</i></p> <p><i>The watershed pages provided did not show any detailed indication of specific habitat features.</i></p>
<p><b>4. Actions and geographic areas</b></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?</li> <li>• Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?</li> <li>• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?</li> <li>• Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rating:</b>    ___ Excellent<sup>50</sup>    <u>  X  </u> Good    ___ Fair    ___ Poor</p>

<sup>49</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

<sup>50</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The level of specificity for actions within priority basins varies widely. Basins are prioritized based on species presence, but no additional prioritization of geographic areas is provided. This results in a huge amount of priority area with limited additional information regarding where to focus highest priority efforts.*

**5. Community issues**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

**Rating:**      \_\_\_Excellent<sup>51</sup>      \_\_\_Good        X  Fair      \_\_\_Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Community issues are not clearly defined outside of the problem of how to deal with a diverse set of watersheds and differing communities for these areas. This issue may be addressed somewhat to the extent WRIA 20 works in conjunction with others in the Coastal salmon recovery region.*

*The strategy will need an updated treatment of community issues and outreach to clearly define where the community supports or does not support salmon recovery. Certain areas clearly show greater coordination and commitment to ecosystem and salmon. Pointing out how these came about could be useful for identifying community actions for other less supported areas.*

<sup>51</sup> In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

## 10. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

**Rating:** \_\_\_ Excellent<sup>52</sup>    **X** **Good**    **X** **Fair**    \_\_\_ Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The approach to prioritization is of a general nature, making certainty difficult to achieve.*

*The strategy uses LFA and it does not appear that more quantitative analyses were available or utilized to any extent.*

## **Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan**

### **7. Actions and geographic areas**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

**Rating:** \_\_\_ **X** **Excellent**<sup>53</sup>    \_\_\_ Good    \_\_\_ Fair    \_\_\_ Poor

### **Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*The list contained only one project.*

*The project clearly treats an identified limiting factor for the Calawah basin (a Tier 1 basin in the NOPL strategy). The project is in the right sequence for the basin. It is not easy to see how this project fits into the larger scope for WRIA 20 as there is not really a prioritized list of actions for WRIA 20 as opposed to the entire NOPL area.*

<sup>52</sup> In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<sup>53</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

### ***8. Fit of project ranking***

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

**Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_Excellent<sup>54</sup> \_\_\_\_\_Good \_\_\_\_\_Fair \_\_\_\_\_Poor

**Narrative (rationale for rating):**

*Not applicable. There was only one project on the list.*

### **ADDITIONAL NOTES:**

*The NOPLE strategy was used as the basis for the project list, evaluations of strategy quality and fit.*

*The lead entity is actively involved in a discussion of regionalization in the coastal salmon recovery region.*

---

<sup>54</sup> To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.