

NATIONAL
FISH HABITAT
PARTNERSHIP



Conference Call of the National Fish Habitat Board

Meeting Book for The
National Fish Habitat Board

January 20, 2016



**National Fish Habitat Board
Conference Call and WebEx
January 20, 2016**

Draft Agenda and Board Book Tabs

Conference Line: 866-560-0760 **Passcode:** 2832957

WebEx link: <https://mmancusa.webex.com/mmancusa/j.php?MTID=m3f1bafc64b91b527fb79f1eadd74ff9c>

Wednesday, January 20, 2016

1:00-1:10	<u>Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping</u> <i>Desired outcomes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board action to approve draft October 2015 Meeting Summary• Board awareness of 2016 Board meeting schedule and format	Tom Champeau (<i>Board Chair/FWCC</i>)	Tab 1
1:10-1:40	<u>2016 Board Budget and Priorities</u> <i>Desired outcome:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board action to approve the 2016 Board budget and priorities	Ryan Roberts (<i>Board Staff/AFWA</i>) & Emily Greene (<i>Board Staff/NOAA-contract</i>)	Tab 2
1:40-2:10	<u>Secretarial MOU</u> <i>Desired outcome:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board awareness of progress towards renewal• Board discussion of next steps	Cecilia Lewis (<i>Board Staff/USFWS</i>)	
2:10-2:25	<u>FY16 USFWS Allocation Method Update</u> <i>Desired outcome:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board awareness of FWS NFHAP Allocation Method modification	David Hoskins (<i>Board Member/USFWS</i>)	Tab 3
2:25 - 2:35	<u>Communications Update</u> <i>Desired outcome:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board awareness of recent 501(c)(3) and Marketing and Branding Team activities.• Board awareness of progress on Communications Plan (3-5yr) development	Ryan Roberts (<i>Board Staff/AFWA</i>)	Tab 4
2:35 - 2:45	<u>Legislation Update</u> <i>Desired outcome:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board awareness of the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act status	Mike Leonard (<i>Board Member/ASA</i>)	
2:45 - 2:50	<u>Executive Leadership Team Update</u> <i>Desired outcome:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board awareness of recent ELT decisions	Ron Regan (<i>Board Member/AFWA</i>)	Tab 5
2:50 - 3:00	<u>Meeting Wrap-Up</u>	Tom Champeau (<i>Board Chair/FWCC</i>)	



Draft National Fish Habitat Board Meeting Summary: October 20-21 2015

Members present:

Mike Andrews (TNC)	Pat Montanio for Sam Rauch (NMFS)
Doug Beard (USGS)	Bryan Moore <i>for</i> Chris Wood (TU)
Tom Bigford (AFS)	Chris Moore (MAFMC)
Tom Champeau (SEAFWA)	Ed Schriever (WAFWA)
Ellen Gilinsky (EPA)	Dan Shively <i>for</i> Rob Harper (USFS)
Jimmy Hague for Whit Fosburgh (TRCP)	Leroy Young (NEAFWA)
Kelly Hepler (At-Large State Seat)	By Phone: Stan Allen (PSMFC)
David Hoskins <i>for</i> Dan Ashe (USFWS)	

Members absent:

Doug Boyd (SBPC), Mike Leonard (ASA), Kelley Myers (MAFWA), Ron Regan (AFWA), Ron Skates (NAWS), and Sean Stone (CCA)

Motions approved:

- June National Fish Habitat Board Conference Call and WebEx Summary with revision

Approved by consensus:

- Tom Champeau as Chair of the National Fish Habitat Board
- Chris Moore as Vice Chair of the National Fish Habitat Board

Motions failed:

- Chris Moore makes a motion to approve the "Network of Fish Habitat Partnerships" terminology and associated logos, Tom Champeau seconds. (Six in favor, 6 opposed, 1 abstained)

Updates and discussions:

- Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping – Changes to agenda were noted including moving the FHP workshop report-out to day one of the Board meeting, and moving the AFS update to day two. A formal vote of the agenda was deemed unneeded. An update with regard to upcoming meetings was provided and the Great Plains FHP coordinator noted that he will give some thought to a 2017 Fall meeting location. One correction to the June Board conference call and webinar summary was noted: the action item regarding getting back to AFWA on their Board seat should actually be NFWF.
- Executive Leadership Team Update – The USFWS ELT member provided an update. With regard to the NFWF seat, it was noted that more discussion is needed there.
- Secretarial MOU – The Board viewed a presentation highlighting information provided in the agency MOU reports. The group then discussed how Federal funding opportunities could be made better known to the FHPs, and helping them to be more competitive. They discussed what the benefits of the MOU have been, and how to be more strategic, including focusing efforts on one or two actions in the MOU. The group discussed whether or not to change the MOU or renew as is and on what time frame. There was a comment with regard to renewing the MOU as part of the ten year anniversary and a comment with regard to the degree to which federal agencies are committed to leveraging opportunities.
- FHP Workshop – A summary of the FHP workshop was provided. The importance of funding an FHP workshop and that it occur with the Board meeting was highlighted. The focus of the discussion that followed was around FHP concern about the USFWS Funding Methodology measure 4 causing a shift towards shorter term projects, and how it can be addressed while still maintaining accountability and project completion within a time frame.
- 2015 National Fish Habitat Assessment – The group viewed presentations on the inland assessment, the

marine assessment, and the data viewer. Follow-up questions varied, however common themes pertaining to the inland assessment included how well it reflects current condition, data used, how it is or could be used in the management context, and incorporating future conditions into the risk index.

- Committee Report-Outs – The group heard progress on 2015 priorities and 2016 priorities from the Science and Data Committee, the Communications Committee, Legislative Team, and Partnerships Committee. Follow-up discussion with regard to communications included a strategy for rolling out the assessment and an overall communications plan (3-4 years), and keeping the AFS videos in mind for the 10-year anniversary. With regard to legislation, it was noted that not a lot of progress is expected for the rest of 2015, so 2016 will be the focus for action. USFWS noted concerns with the bill with respect to their ability to implement the program if enacted as currently written.
- Budget and 2016 Priorities – The 2016 Budget and Priorities were discussed briefly, however the Board requested that the budget be placed in a different format and that the key unfunded items be identified. There was a request that a FHP Workshop be added to the list of priorities.
- 501(c)(3) Development and Marketing Update – It was reported that the IRS awarded 501c3 status to the Fund very quickly and that the Mid-Atlantic Council had provided the first investment. The group then discussed adoption of the “Network of FHPs” terminology, for which arguments in favor and against were provided. Comments were provided by both Board members and Partnership representatives; however it was noted that it was a missed opportunity to have not discussed with the FHPs at the workshop. A motion to approve use of the terminology did not pass.
- Seeking NFHAP Candidate Status for the Pacific Lamprey FHP – The group viewed a presentation from members of the Pacific Lamprey Conservation Initiative. There was follow-up discussion of process, during which it was noted that the Initiative is now considered to have candidate FHP status. There was additional discussion of the Initiative in terms of the uniqueness of the species, and its importance to Tribes. There was discussion that the candidate FHP be value-added, that it had communicated with the other FHPs, and that it would not be eligible for USFWS funding given the current policy cap of funding 18 Partnerships.
- California Fish Passage Forum Partnership Presentation – The group viewed a presentation from a representative of the California Fish Passage Forum.
- AFS Symposium Update – An overview of NFHP activities at the recent AFS Annual Meeting were provided to the group, followed by a brief discussion of lessons learned. Successes were attributed to communication style, location of the booth, and the type of presenters (ie. practitioners).
- FHP Evaluation Update – The update to the Board included noting low scoring questions and which questions could be improved upon. Follow-up discussion included integrating FHP data, capturing success stories and getting them out to the legislative and communications team, capturing the different work that FHPs are doing, capturing challenges, and a request for the Board to work with FHPs that scored poorly to bring their scores up. There was also a discussion of process, including a rotating question scheme, communication with the USFWS, and standardizing the answers that work for both processes.
- FY16 USFWS Funding Methodology and USFWS FAC Strategic Plan – The group was provided a walk-through of the USFWS FAC Strategic Plan and an update that annual implementation plans are being developed with the regions. With regard to the funding methodology, it was noted that changes would be worked through the internal decision tree, then the coordinators, and then provided to the FHPs.
- NOAA Fisheries Habitat Enterprise Strategic Plan – An overview of the draft Plan was provided to the group. Follow-up discussion included a suggestion to reach out to groups like TRCP and Forest Service and the deadline for providing input.
- Demonstration of the Project Tracking Database – The group was made aware of the tasks that were needed to improve the database and timeframe, in addition to key decisions that would need to be made. Follow-up discussion included defining what projects should go into the database (ie. funded, endorsed, and other).
- National Fish Habitat Board Leadership – Members of the nomination committee were made known to the group, their task, and their findings, which included individuals for the next Chair and Vice Chair of the National Fish Habitat Board.

Action items:

- Develop a list of federal funding opportunities and post on line and help FHPs be more competitive.
- Renew the MOU with no changes and develop a letter that highlights the successes and why it's a good thing. Have draft developed, reviewed, and to the secretary office before the holidays.
- Pick one or two items in the MOU to focus efforts.
- Develop a roll-out strategy for the Assessment
- Develop 3-4 year communications strategy
- Revise budget format and identify key unfunded items
- SDC will take the lead in reviewing materials provided by the Pacific Lamprey Candidate FHP. Staff will also review and formulate a recommendation for Board consideration in January.
- The Pacific Lamprey Candidate FHP will provide a presentation and the Board will vote in January.
- SEAK videos from AFS are being edited and will be made available to the Board and FHPs.
- The Board will provide comment on the NOAA Fisheries Habitat Enterprise Strategic Plan.

Future Board meetings:

- January 20 teleconference, March 8-9 in Arlington, June 29 teleconference, Summer teleconference (for new Board members), October 26-27 in the Florida Panhandle

Board approved documents:

- June Board Conference Call and WebEx Summary with revision.

Additional attendees:

John Bragg (PMEP)	Dan Isaak (USFS)
Robin Carlson (PSMFC)	Heidi Keuler (Fishers and Farmers FHP)
Dan Castleberry (USFWS)	Steve Krentz (Great Plains FHP)
Bob Clarke (USFWS)	Stafford Lehr (CA DFW)
Wes Daniel (MI State U.)	Cecilia Lewis (Board Staff – USFWS)
Laura Deighan (USFWS)	Bob Pagliuco (CFPF)
Roy Elicker (USFWS)	Alex Pitts (USFWS)
Susan Flenburg (SWAK FHP)	Miranda Plum (USFWS)
Pam Fuller (USGS)	Donnie Ratcliff (CFPF)
Jessica Graham (SARP)	Ryan Roberts (Board Staff - AFWA)
Emily Greene (Board Staff – NOAA contract)	Pete Ruhl (SDC Co-Chair USGS)
Roger Harding (AKDFG)	Joe Sheahan (Great Lakes FHP)
Deborah Hart (SEAK FHP)	Gordon Smith (HFHP)
Elsa Haubold (LCC Network)	Jon Sjoberg (DFHP)
Lisa Havel (ACFHP)	Therese Thompson (WNTI)
Nina Hemphill (USFS)	Tim Troll (SWAK FHP)
Jessica Hogrefe (USFWS)	Gary Whelan (SDC Co-Chair – MI DNR)

By Phone: Daniel Wieferich (USGS), Kristan Blackhart (NOAA contract), Steve Perry (EBTJV), Eli Gerson (Design & Image), Dr. Daniel Obenour (NC State University), and Jonathan Miller (NC State University)

National Fish Habitat Board Meetings 2016 -2017

Year	Date	Location	Comments
2016	January 20 (Wed)	Tele/web conference	Annual budget & priorities
	March 8-9 (Tues-Wed)	Arlington, VA	The Nature Conservancy
	June 29 (Wed)	Tele/web conference	
	Summer	Tele/web conference	Introductory call for new members.
	October 26-27 (Wed-Thurs)	Florida Panhandle	Panama City, Pensacola, or Destin.
2017	January 18 (Wed)	Tele/web conference	Annual budget & priorities
	March 7-8 (Tues – Wed)	Washington, DC Area	Reserve room at TNC HQ
	June 28 (Wed)	Tele/web conference	
	Summer	Tele/web conference	Introductory call for new members.
	October 18 – 19 (Wed-Thurs)	TBD – Staff welcome suggestions from the Board.	There are many places where the Board has not met (e.g. Northern Great Plains and Ohio River Basin). Staff welcome suggestions for specific locations within these regional examples or beyond.

Record of Past Board Meetings 2006 -2014

Year	Date	Location	Facility
2006	September 22	Aspen, Colorado	Hotel
	November 16	Washington, DC	Hall of States
2007	January 16	Teleconference	
	March 1-2	Washington, DC	Environmental Protection Agency
	June 6-7	Washington, DC	Commerce Department
	October 2-3	Arlington, VA	Hotel
2008	February 20-21	St. Petersburg, FL	Tampa Bay Watch
	May 13-14	Arlington, VA	The Nature Conservancy
	October 7-8	Arlington, VA	The Nature Conservancy
2009	March 4-5	Harrisburg, PA	Pennsylvania Fish & Boat Commission
	June 25, 2009	Leesburg, VA	National Conference Center

	October 7-8	Arlington, VA	The Nature Conservancy
2010	January 15	Teleconference	
	March 3-4	Memphis, TN	Ducks Unlimited
	June 9-10	Silver Spring, MD	NOAA headquarters
	August 25	Teleconference	
	October 12-14	Portland, OR	Columbia River Intertribal Fisheries Commission
2011	January 13	Teleconference	
	March 11	Teleconference	
	April 12-13	Arlington, VA	The Nature Conservancy
	July 26-27	Madison, WI	Hotel
	October 19-20	Albuquerque, NM	FWS Regional Office
2012	January 12	Teleconference	
	March 1	Teleconference	
	April 17-18	Arlington, VA	The Nature Conservancy
	July 10-11	Portland, ME	Hotel
	October 16-17	Ridgedale, MO	Big Cedar Lodge
2013	January 16	Teleconference	
	February 26-27	Arlington, VA	FWS headquarters
	April 15	Teleconference	
	June 25-26	Salt Lake City, UT	Utah State Capitol
	October 22-23	Charleston, SC	SC DNR
2014	January 15	Teleconference	
	March 9-10	Denver, CO	
	June 25	Tele/web conference	
	November 8-9	National Harbor, MD	Held in conjunction w/ RAE Summit
2015	January 14	Tele/web conference	
	March 3-4	Arlington, VA	The Nature Conservancy
	June 24	Tele/web conference	
	September 22	Tele/web conference	Introductory call for new members and interested individuals.
	October 20-21	Sacramento, CA	Hotel

Total: 41 (in-person and teleconference) meetings held to date

Title: 2016 National Fish Habitat Board Budget and Priorities

Desired Outcome: Board action to approve the 2016 Board budget and priorities.

Background:

2016 Board Budget

The National Fish Habitat Board is presented with its annual operations budget during its January teleconference for approval. A draft was presented to the Board for consideration and feedback at the October 2015 meeting. Since that meeting, the organization of the budget has been significantly revised, to improve readability and discussion. This revised budget (Tab 2a) is organized as follows:

- Board activities and FHP activities have been separated into two different columns (Board activities on the left, and FHP activities on the right). For the purposes of the 2016 Board budget approval, we are concerned only with the left column – the Board activities.
- Revenues have been separated from expenses (revenues in the top rows, and expenses in the rows below).
- The balanced budget is shown in the main table, as signified by green cells.
- Those priorities that are needs for NFHP, but are outside of the scope of this budget are shown in red, below the balanced budget.

Please note that there is one source of revenue not shown in this budget: NFWF/State funds in the amount of approximately \$15,000. These funds are not enough to cover any one unfunded priority, and staff recommends keeping these as security/carry-over for the next year.

2016 Board Priorities

The Board Priorities document represents a set of tasks that the Board, working with its staff, committees, and partners, can reasonably achieve in the calendar 2016 year, with adequate funding and in-kind support. A draft set of priorities were presented to the Board for consideration and feedback at the October 2015 meeting. At that time, the suggestion was made to include one additional priority: a Fish Habitat Partnership workshop. This has been added as Priority R: Host an Excellence Workshop for Fish Habitat Partnerships. To facilitate discussion, Board staff have also created a new priority P: Ensure the Function of the Board's Science and Data Committee which covers Committee operational needs. The 2016 priorities (Tab 2a) are not listed in order of importance, and with the exception of the priorities noted in red cells in the budget (Tab 2b), are accounted for either through in-kind services or existing or expected funding.

Staff Recommendations:

- The highest unfunded priority is to complete the project tracking database, the second highest unfunded priority is to host an FHP workshop. Staff welcomes Board recommendations for how to secure funding to achieve these priorities in 2016.
- The remaining priorities shown in red are also important, however the project tracking database rises to the top because it will be an important tool for capturing and sharing NFHP accomplishments, and can facilitate future FHP performance evaluations. The FHP workshop is second in priority because it was noted by the FHPs that the 2015 workshop was useful and that they would like to see a workshop occur on an annual/biannual basis. Ability to network with fellow coordinators, staff, and Board members were cited as having high value.

Briefing Book Materials: Tab 2b – 2016 Board Budget, 2c – 2016 Board Priorities

**National Fish Habitat Board
DRAFT 2016 Budget v1**

REVENUES (Board Activities)				
	AFWA/FWS Coop (2102)	MSCG Operations 3 - (2154A)	Other - (FWS)	TOTAL
Income	\$ 64,000	\$ 93,988	\$ 160,000	\$ 317,988
Carryover	\$ 95,000			\$ 95,000
SUBTOTAL	\$ 159,000	\$ 93,988	\$ 160,000	\$ 412,988

REVENUES (FHP Activities supported by AFWA/MSCGP)*			
MSCG - FHP Coordination (2154B)	MSCG - FHP Coordination (2155)	MSCG - FHP Coordination (2156)	
\$ 41,230			\$ 86,000
	\$ 248,005		
\$ 41,230	\$ 248,005	\$ 86,000	

EXPENSES				
Coordination of Board and FHPs				
Salaries and Benefits				\$ -
Travel - Board functions	\$ (8,000)			\$ (8,000)
Travel - Staff	\$ (6,000)			\$ (6,000)
Supplies		\$ (9,000)		\$ (9,000)
Contractual to FHPs				\$ -
SUBTOTAL	\$ (14,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ -	\$ (23,000)
Communications				
Salaries and Benefits	\$ (70,000)	\$ (44,700)		\$ (114,700)
Awards	\$ (3,000)			\$ (3,000)
Annual Report	\$ (2,697)			\$ (2,697)
Communications Products	\$ (1,500)			\$ (1,500)
Telephone	\$ (1,000)			\$ (1,000)
Travel - Communications Coordinator	\$ (10,000)	\$ (7,700)		\$ (17,700)
Contractual				\$ -
Priority E: Public Relations and Marketing Resources for the NFHP 2015 Status Report	\$ (2,000)			\$ (2,000)
Priority F: NFHP website re-development.		\$ (20,000)		\$ (20,000)
Priority I: Increase usage of video and further campaign to document work of Fish Habitat Partnerships.	\$ (5,000)			\$ (5,000)
Priority K: Increase outreach of Waters to Watch Campaign for its Ten Year Anniversary	\$ (3,000)			\$ (3,000)
SUBTOTAL	\$ (98,197)	\$ (72,400)	\$ -	\$ (170,597)
Science & Data				
Priority P: Ensure the function of the Board's Science and Data Committee (Committee) a. Support Co-Chair efforts to promote and lead the activities of the Committee	\$ (13,000)			\$ (13,000)
Priority Q: Begin work on 2020 Assessment: Inland Assessment - \$160,000 for MSU – expected to be met by US FWS in 2016.			\$ (160,000)	\$ (160,000)
SUBTOTAL	\$ (13,000)	\$ -	\$ (160,000)	\$ (173,000)
TOTAL DIRECT	\$ (125,197)	\$ (81,400)	\$ (160,000)	\$ (366,597)
IDC	\$ (33,803)	\$ (12,588)		\$ (46,391)
TOTAL INDIRECT	\$ (33,803)	\$ (12,588)	\$ -	\$ (46,391)
NET	\$ (0)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (0)

	\$ (5,700)		
\$ (40,605)	\$ (230,000)	\$ (71,667)	
\$ (40,605)	\$ (235,700)	\$ (71,667)	
\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
\$ (40,605)	\$ (235,700)	\$ (71,667)	
\$ (626)	\$ (12,305)	\$ (14,333)	
\$ (626)	\$ (12,305)	\$ (14,333)	
\$ (1)	\$ -	\$ -	

*Does not count FHP Support provided by other entities.

EXPENSES OUTSIDE THIS BUDGET				
Priority N: Complete and implement National Project Database (first of three years of funding)				\$ (37,000)
Priority R: Host an Excellence Workshop for the FHPs				\$ (20,000)
Priority G: Continue development of the NFHP Marketing Campaign and re-branding efforts for the NFHP program and the FHPs.				\$ (50,000)
Priority P: Ensure the function of the Board's Science and Data Committee (Committee) b. Support an in-person meeting of the Committee to include additional FHP science and data expertise attendance.				\$ (20,000)
Priority Q: Begin work on 2020 Assessment - Marine Assessment - \$200,000 for 2 FTEs				\$ (200,000)
Begin work on 2020 Assessment - Incorporation of FHP datasets and process information - \$100,000 for 1 FTE				\$ (100,000)

Title: 2016 Draft Board Priorities

Desired outcome: Board action to approve 2016 Priorities

Priority A: Continue coordination with legislative affairs team in supporting developments of the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act

Priority B: Review current NFHP National Conservation Need and amend as needed.

Priority C: Development of a process that provides a priority ranking of multiple FHP project proposals that are combined for submission to a funding source.

Priority D: Review FHP performance evaluation response forms and identify the scale and scope of the linkages between FHP priorities and the NFHP National Conservation Strategies.

Priority E: PR and Marketing Resources for the NFHP 2015 Status Report

Priority F: NFHP website re-development.

Priority G: Continue development of the NFHP Marketing Campaign and re-branding efforts for the NFHP program and the FHPs.

Priority H: Continue building database for newsletter distribution to increase engagement with partner coalition.

Priority I: Increase usage of video and further campaign to document work of Fish Habitat Partnerships.

Priority J: Continue coordination with legislative affairs team in supporting developments of the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act

Priority K: Increase outreach of Waters to Watch Campaign for its Ten Year Anniversary

Priority L: Review and make any needed changes to the communications strategy (Board approved 2011 and updated in 2013) to ensure that it remains a guide for committee work and maintained as a living document.

Priority M: Complete and publish electronically the 2015 National Assessment

Priority N: Complete and implement National Project Database

Priority O: Reinstitute work on a set of evaluation standards for a range of habitat projects

- a. Complete MOU with AFS and AFS Habitat Section

Priority P: Ensure the function of the Board's Science and Data Committee (Committee)

- a. Support Co-Chair efforts to promote and lead the activities of the Committee.

This would occur through the in-person efforts of the Co-chairs to:

- i. Engage in-person with the Board, FHPs, and the Science and Data Committee
- ii. Promote the products of the Science and Data Committee to a broad audience including AFWA, AFS and other entities and to generate additional opportunities to further the Board's science and data vision
- b. Support an in-person meeting of the Committee to include additional FHP science and data expertise attendance. This meeting would be used to cover the following:
 - i. Analysis and review of the 2015 Assessment Process to generate insights on how to better implement the 2020 Assessment
 - ii. Setting the Direction of the 2020 Assessment
 - iii. Project Database Project review and analysis
 - iv. Discuss interactions between and expectations for the Board and FHP Science and Data Efforts
 - v. Begin a Review of the existing NFHP Science and Data Strategy

Priority Q: Begin work on 2020 Assessment

- a. Reinstitute work to capture FHP data and assessments for future incorporation into 2020 National Assessment
 - i. Continue work to find new datasets for 2020 National Assessment
- b. Initiate incorporation of lakes into the National Assessment
 - ii. Detailed scoping of process and data needs by SDC
 - iii. Review of geospatial framework of lakesheds by SDC
- c. Select 1 to 2 system processes for full integration into 2020 National Assessment and begin process of integration
 - iv. Best candidates are hydrology and connectivity
 - v. Start regionally with incorporation of process data
- d. Marine assessment review
 - vi. Develop a strategic vision and workplan for marine assessment
 - vii. Determine how to implement Gulf Coast assessment for other coasts

- viii. Develop plan on how to integrate inland assessment scores into estuary assessment scores.
 - 1. Evaluate procedures being considered for Chesapeake Bay (http://www.chesapeakebay.net/managementstrategies/strategy/fish_habitat)
- e. Ensure that SDC is fully informed of progress on all marine coasts including Great Lakes
- f. Continue discussion on how to effectively measure habitat condition in AK considering the low species diversity and recovered landscape

Priority R: Host an Excellence Workshop for Fish Habitat Partnerships



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Washington, D.C. 20240

NOV 20 2015



In Reply Refer To:
FWS/AFAC/ 061800

Memorandum

To: Regional Directors 1-8
Attention: Assistant Regional Directors – Fish and Aquatic Conservation

Deputy
From:

Director

Subject: Modifying the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's National Fish Habitat Action Plan Project Funding Allocation Method

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is committed to supporting the National Fish Habitat Action Plan (Action Plan/NFHAP) – a science-based, voluntary effort to address fish and aquatic habitat issues – and the Fish Habitat Partnerships (FHPs) that implement it. In 2013, the Service adopted a competitive, performance-based method for allocating project funds under the Action Plan. The new allocation method was implemented in fiscal year (FY) 2014 and required FHPs seeking Service Action Plan project funds to submit a Work Plan and Accomplishments Report (Report) to the Service for funding consideration.

The Service has been tracking the effectiveness of the new allocation method by monitoring our partners' abilities to implement on-the-ground aquatic habitat conservation and our ability to achieve our mission while supporting the goals of the Action Plan. In general, the allocation method serves its intended purpose. However, we have received feedback from a number of partners regarding the criterion used to evaluate an FHP's past performance. In particular, our partners have voiced concerns about criterion # 4, Project Completion and Success, which is used to determine the percentage of Service funded projects that have been completed according to project design in the previous three fiscal years. Specifically, concerns are that criterion #4 discourages longer-term projects with potentially better conservation outcomes.

To address these concerns, criterion #4 of the NFHAP Allocation Method, will be modified as follows:

4. Project Completion and Success:

What percentage of projects, funded in whole or in part, with FWS NFHAP funds, have been completed consistent with the project design? (choose one)

- 40 percent within the past three fiscal years
- 60 percent within the past four fiscal years
- 80 percent within the past five fiscal years
- Less than 40 percent within the past three fiscal years

The modified criterion will replace the current Criterion #4 in the Service's NFHAP Project Funding Allocation Method approved December 2013. All other criteria remain the same. FHPs seeking FY16 project funds should submit a Work Plan and Accomplishments Report by January 5, 2016 to their respective Regional Coordinator and the National Coordinator.

The Service looks forward to continuing its support of the Action Plan and partnering with the FHPs. If you have questions regarding modifications to criterion #4 in the FWS NFHAP Project Funding Allocation Method, please contact Mr. David Hoskins, the Service's Assistant Director for Fish and Aquatic Conservation, at 703-358-2250 or David_Hoskins@fws.gov.

Attachments



NFHAP Project Funding Allocation Method

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

November 2015

Table of Contents

(Click on the title to move to the section.)

[A competitive, performance-based approach to allocate flexible funds to implement the National Fish Habitat Action Plan](#)

[Background](#)

[New approach to allocating funds](#)

[Table 1. Summary of criteria at each performance level](#)

[Appendix 1. Annual Timeline for Allocating NFHAP Project Funds](#)

[Appendix 2. Instructions for Fish Habitat Partnerships - Work Plans and Accomplishment Reports](#)

[FWS Regional NFHP Coordinators](#)

[Appendix 3. Definitions for Performance Level Criteria](#)

A competitive, performance-based approach to allocate flexible funds to implement the National Fish Habitat Action Plan

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
November 2015**

Background ([return to Table of Contents](#))

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service receives annual appropriations to implement the National Fish Habitat Action Plan. Under Service policy ([717 FW 1](#)), funds are used to:

1. Support our participation in the National Fish Habitat Board and activities of the Board.
2. Support Action Plan coordination and leadership at the Regional level.
3. Implement habitat-based cost-shared projects.

Funds used to implement habitat-based cost-shared projects (project funds) are “flexible”, i.e. subject to re-allocation each year. The Service policy states that each year, the Director “allocates the available project funding among Fish Habitat Partnerships consistent with the goals and strategies of the National Fish Habitat Board” and “issues guidance for project selection”.

Fish Habitat Partnerships (FHPs) have now been established throughout the United States. It is timely to put in place a method of allocating project funds that will provide long-term predictability and that will help the Service to meet its mission through more strategic delivery of fish habitat conservation projects.

New approach to allocating funds ([return to Table of Contents](#))

Starting in FY 2014, the Service will implement a competitive, performance-based process to allocate project funds. Each year the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) will distribute project funds to FHPs in two categories: 1) stable operational support and 2) competitive, performance-based funds to encourage strategic conservation delivery. All project funds in both categories must be accounted for in the Fisheries Information System annually.

Stable Operational Support

Stable operational support will be provided to FHPs at a level of \$75,000/year. FHPs may use the funds for operations (coordination, outreach, travel, etc.) and/or for fish habitat conservation projects (habitat restoration, assessment, planning, etc.) to maximize conservation results, with no restrictions on how the funds are split between operations and projects. To receive stable operational support each year, a partnership must meet the criteria set by the National Fish Habitat Board for recognizing FHPs (see [Policies and Guidance for Fish Habitat Partnerships](#)) and must submit a Work Plan and Accomplishments Report.

Competitive, Performance-based Support

Competitive, performance-based funds consist of the remaining project funds spread across three performance levels. FHPs will be assigned a performance level based on their ability to meet an increasingly complex set of criteria. At each performance level, an FHP must meet *all* criteria in order to qualify for that performance level. The criteria and their corresponding performance levels are listed below and summarized in [Table 1](#). The basis for assigning FHP performance levels will be 1) a work plan with a one-year planning horizon, detailing how the FHP and its partners propose to use FWS project funds and 2) an accomplishments report describing how the FHP has implemented projects in the previous three to five years, utilizing the following criteria.

Criteria at each Performance Level

1. Meet the basic FHP requirements established by the National Fish Habitat Board for strategic planning and assessments
 - Performance level 1 = Coordinate and compile scientific assessment information on fish habitats within the FHP's boundaries
 - Performance level 2 = Identify and include plan to fill data gaps necessary to refine and complete fish habitat assessments; incorporates existing habitat assessments into FHP Strategic Plans
 - Performance level 3 = Fill data gaps and refine habitat assessments, including climate change considerations, for incorporation into Science and Data Committee's National Assessment
2. Execute projects that benefit FHP priority species or priority areas (applies to projects conducted over the previous 3 years)
 - Performance level 1 = 75% of projects focus on FHP priority species or priority areas
 - Performance level 2 = 85% of projects focus on FHP priority species or priority areas
 - Performance level 3 = 95% of projects focus on FHP priority species or priority areas
3. Execute projects that benefit FWS priority species / trust resources (applies to projects conducted over the previous 3 years)
 - Performance level 1 = 25% of projects address habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
 - Performance level 2 = 50% of projects address habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
 - Performance level 3 = 75% of projects address habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
4. Project Completion and Success
 - Performance level 1 = 40% of projects funded by FWS NFHAP dollars, in whole or in part, during the prior three years have been completed consistent with the project design
 - Performance level 2 = 60% of projects funded by FWS NFHAP dollars, in whole or in part, during the prior four years have been completed consistent with the project design

- Performance level 3 = 80% of projects funded by FWS NFHAP dollars, in whole or in part, during the prior five years have been completed consistent with the project design
5. Monitoring and Evaluation (applies to projects conducted over the previous 3 years)
- Performance level 1 = 50% of projects include a monitoring and evaluation plan
 - Performance level 2 = 75% of projects include a monitoring and evaluation plan
 - Performance level 3 = 90% of projects include a monitoring and evaluation plan
6. Leveraging of FWS NFHAP Project Funds
- Performance level 1 = 1:1 leveraging achieved over a 3 year period
 - Performance level 2 = 2:1 leveraging achieved over a 3 year period
 - Performance level 3 = 3:1 leveraging achieved over a 3 year period
7. Strategic Implementation
- Performance level 1 = 75% of proposed projects include measureable goals and objectives to address: 1) FHP priority species or priority areas; or 2) habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
 - Performance level 2 = 85% of proposed projects include measureable goals and objectives to address: 1) FHP priority species or priority areas; or 2) habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
 - Performance level 3 = 95% of proposed projects include measureable goals and objectives to address: 1) FHP priority species or priority areas; or 2) habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
8. Conservation Actions and Project Outcomes
- Performance level 1 = 50% of proposed projects specify conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives
 - Performance level 2 = 75% of proposed projects specify conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives
 - Performance level 3 = 100% of proposed projects specify conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives

Table 1. Summary of criteria at each performance level ([return to Table of Contents](#))

Criteria	Performance Levels		
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Evaluating past performance			
Basic FHP Requirements	Coordinate and compile scientific assessment information on fish habitats within FHP boundaries	Identify and include plan to fill data gaps necessary to refine and complete fish habitat assessment; incorporate existing habitat assessments into FHP Strategic Plan	Fill data gaps, including climate change considerations, for incorporation into the NFHP Science and Data Committee's National Assessment
FHP Priority Areas / Species	75% of projects focus on FHP priority species or priority areas	85% of projects focus on FHP priority species or priority areas	95% of projects focus on FHP priority species or priority areas
FWS Priority Species / Trust Resources	25% of projects address habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources	50% of projects address habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources	75% of projects address habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
Project Completion and Success	40% of projects funded by FWS during the prior three years have been completed consistent with the project design	60% of projects funded by FWS during the prior four years have been completed consistent with the project design	80% of projects funded by FWS during the prior five years have been completed consistent with the project design
Monitoring and Evaluation	50% of projects include a monitoring and evaluation plan	75% of projects include a monitoring and evaluation plan	90% of projects include a monitoring and evaluation plan
Leveraging of FWS NFHAP Project Funds	Leverage funding over a 3 year period of at least 1:1	Leverage funding over a 3 year period of at least 2:1	Leverage funding over a 3 year period of at least 3:1
Evaluating proposed projects			
Strategic Implementation	75% of proposed projects include measureable goals and objectives to address: 1) FHP priority species or priority areas; or 2) habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources	85% of proposed projects include measureable goals and objectives to address: 1) FHP priority species or priority areas; or 2) habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources	95% of proposed projects include measureable goals and objectives to address: 1) FHP priority species or priority areas; 2) or habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
Conservation Actions and Project Outcomes	50% of proposed projects specify conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives	75% of proposed projects specify conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives	100% of proposed projects specify conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives

Funding at each Performance Level

Each successive performance level increases in complexity and is associated with a proportional increase in funding amount. The amount of funds at each performance level will depend on annual appropriations and will be made available at each level based on the following formula:

$$F = N_1(X) + N_2 (3X) + N_3 (5X)$$

Where:

F = Amount of funding available in a given year after stable operational support is met

N₁ = Number of FHPs at Performance Level 1

N₂ = Number of FHPs at Performance Level 2

N₃ = Number of FHPs at Performance Level 3

X = Amount of funding an FHP in performance level 1 receives

3X = Amount of funding an FHP in performance level 2 receives

5X = Amount of funding an FHP in performance level 3 receives

Each FHP will be required to produce a Work Plan and Accomplishments Report (Report). The FWS will use information provided in the report to determine the amount of project funding the FHP receives. The process and timeline for reviewing the FHPs' reports is shown in Appendix 1. Instructions for writing the report are in Appendix 2.

Adjustments for fluctuations in NFHAP funding

Every eligible FHP will receive \$75,000 each year for stable operational support. Project funds, beyond stable operational support, will vary from year to year based on the total amount of NFHAP funding available and the number of FHPs at each performance level. NFHAP funding support is only available to fund projects identified by the eighteen existing FHPs. Partnerships recognized by the National Fish Habitat Board after December 26, 2012 are not eligible to receive an allocation from the existing NFHAP project funds until such time as additional project funds become available for this purpose.

NFHAP Project Implementation

Consistent with the Service policy ([717 FW 1](#)) on NFHAP, we encourage our field stations to develop and implement projects that meet Action Plan criteria. If we cannot implement a project, we may use a cooperative agreement, grant, or contract to fund NFHAP projects that a partner organization will complete.

Expiration and Modification of the Methodology

This methodology will remain in place until passage of the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act or at the direction of the Director. Performance measurements at each level may need to be modified or enhanced as our collective scientific knowledge matures.

Annual Timeline for Allocating NFHAP Project Funds ([return to Table of Contents](#))

The actual timing of events may vary depending on the appropriations process.

January	FHPs submit work plans and accomplishment reports to FWS lead Region for each FHP, and to the Board
February	Board reviews FHP submissions and provides comments and recommendations to RCs RCs individually review FHP submissions from their respective Regions, and request additional information or clarification from FHPs, if needed
March	For stable base operational funds, RCs as a group consider Board input and review FHP submissions for consistency. ARDs individually approve FHP submissions from their respective Regions. For competitive, performance-based funds, RCs as a group consider Board input, assign performance levels to FHPs, and forward recommendations to ARDs
April	For stable base operational funds, RDs for lead Regions forward FHP submissions to AD-FAC For competitive, performance-based funds, ARDs as a group review recommendations, revise if needed, and forward recommended performance levels to AD-FAC
May	For stable base operational funds, AD-FAC reviews FHP submissions and forwards allocation to the Director for approval For competitive, performance-based funds, AD-FAC reviews recommended performance levels and forwards allocation to the Director for approval Director informs FHPs of final performance level and allocates project funds to RDs

AD-FAC = Assistant Director-Fish and Aquatic Conservation

RD = Regional Director

ARD = Assistant Regional Director for Fish and Aquatic Conservation

RC = FWS NFHAP Regional Coordinator

FHP = Fish Habitat Partnership

Board = National Fish Habitat Board

**Instructions for Fish Habitat Partnerships
Work Plans and Accomplishment Reports**
([return to Table of Contents](#))

Introduction

Each year, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) will distribute project funds to Fish Habitat Partnerships (FHPs) in support of the National Fish Habitat Action Plan (NFHAP). Project funds will be broken into two categories: 1) stable operational support and 2) competitive, performance-based funds to encourage strategic conservation delivery.

The FWS will use information provided in a Work Plan and Accomplishment Report (Report) to determine the amount of project funding an FHP will receive. To be eligible to receive stable operational support, FHPs must complete Section 1. To compete for performance-based funds, FHPs must complete Sections 2 and 3. The documents must be submitted to the respective NFHAP Regional Coordinator by January of each year. NFHAP Regional Coordinators are listed in a table below.

Instructions

Section 1. Justification for Stable Operational Support (maximum 6 pages)

This section will provide an overview of all projects and activities over the previous three years and anticipated projects and activities over the next three years. The intent is to show the full context of FHP efforts 1) supported by FWS funds, and/or 2) supported by all other sources of funds and in-kind contributions. While intended to be comprehensive, Section 1 need not be highly detailed. It should concisely describe these projects and activities as well as how these projects and activities (both individually and collectively) have contributed, or are expected to contribute, to achieving FHP goals and leverage partner resources and capabilities. The document should be self-contained, without attachments, though links to web-accessible documents may be inserted.

Section 2. Accomplishment Report (3-year reporting period for all criteria except #4)

This section will provide a detailed description of all projects and activities of the FHP over the previous three years and for Criterion #4, over the past three, four, and five fiscal years. The intent is to show the full context of FHP accomplishments that were: 1) supported by FWS funds, and/or 2) supported by all other sources of funds and in-kind contributions. It will include the following checklist, with narrative evidence justifying each response. Provide documentation if necessary, either in an attachment or via web links.

1. Habitat Assessment (choose one):
 - The FHP has coordinated and compiled scientific assessment information on fish habitats within its partnership area.
 - The FHP has identified, and has a plan to fill, data gaps necessary to refine and complete fish habitat assessments, and incorporates existing habitat assessments into the FHP's strategic plan.

- The FHP has filled data gaps and refined habitat assessments, including climate change considerations, for incorporation into the Science and Data Committee's national assessment.

2. FHP Priority Areas / Species:

What percentage of projects initiated in the past three years were focused on FHP defined priority species or priority areas? (choose one)

- At least 75%
- At least 85%
- At least 95%
- Less than 75%

3. FWS Priority Species / Trust Species:

What percentage of projects initiated in the past three years addressed habitat issues for FWS priority or trust resources? (choose one)

- 25%
- 50%
- 75%
- Less than 25%

4. Project Completion and Success:

What percentage of projects, funded in whole or in part, with FWS NFHAP funds have been completed consistent with the project design? (choose one)

- 40% within the past three fiscal years
- 60% within the past four fiscal years
- 80% within the past five fiscal years
- Less than 40% with the past three fiscal years

5. Monitoring and Evaluation:

What percentage of projects initiated in the past three fiscal years included a monitoring and evaluation plan? (choose one)

- 50%
- 75%
- 90%
- Less than 50%

6. Leveraging of Project Funds:

Over a three year period, the FHP leveraged FWS funding by a ratio of (choose one):

- At least 1:1
- At least 2:1
- At least 3:1
- No FWS funds were leveraged

Section 3. Work Plan – (1-year planning horizon)

This section consists of a prioritized list of new or ongoing habitat projects over the next year. FHP coordination and operational expenses should be written up as individual projects and included in this list. The following information must be provided for each prioritized project:

- Project title and number as recorded in the FWS Fisheries Operational Needs System (FONS)
- FWS funds requested, including direct and indirect cost as defined in the FWS policy manual (<http://www.fws.gov/policy/717fw1.pdf>)
- Anticipated partner contributions to the project (cash and in-kind) expressed in dollar value
- Which national conservation strategy, if any, of the National Fish Habitat Board is addressed by the project? The Board's priorities are accessible online at <http://fishhabitat.org/content/nfhp-national-conservation-strategies>.
- Which objective, if any, of the Service's climate change strategy is addressed by the project? The strategy is accessible online at: <http://www.fws.gov/home/climatechange/strategy.html>.

FWS Regional NFHAP Coordinators will work with the FHPs to identify FONS numbers, indirect costs, FWS priority species, and other information as needed. (See list of Regional NFHAP Coordinators on the following page.)

In your narrative, specifically identify the following information and supporting evidence for each new or ongoing project:

1. Measurable goals and objectives that will address: 1) FHP priority species or priority area(s); or 2) habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources
2. Proposed conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives

FWS Regional NFHAP Coordinators ([return to Table of Contents](#))

FWS Region	Coordinator	Phone	E-mail	FHPs in Region
1	Jana Grote	503-231-2387	Jana_Grote@fws.gov	- Hawaii FHP - Pacific Marine and Estuarine Partnership
2	Karin Eldridge	505-248-6471	Karin_Eldridge@fws.gov	- Desert FHP
3	Jessica Hogrefe	612-713-5102	Jessica_Hogrefe@fws.gov	- Driftless Area Restoration Effort - Fishers and Farmers Partnership - Great Lakes Basin FHP - Midwest Glacial Lakes Partnership - Ohio River Basin FHP
4	Tripp Boltin	843-819-1229	Walter_Boltin@fws.gov	- Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership
5	Callie McMunigal	304-536-4760	Callie_Mcmunigal@fws.gov	- Atlantic Coastal FHP - Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture
6	Bill Rice	303-236-4219	William_Rice@fws.gov	- Great Plains FHP
7	David Wigglesworth	907-786-3925	David_Wigglesworth@fws.gov	- Kenai Peninsula FHP - Mat-Su Basin Salmon Habitat Partnership - Southwest Alaska Salmon Habitat Partnership
8	Lisa Heki	775-861-6300	Lisa_G_Heki@fws.gov	- California Fish Passage Forum - Western Native Trout Initiative
HQ	Cecilia Lewis	703-358-2102	Cecilia_Lewis@fws.gov	- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Partnership

Definitions for Performance Level Criteria ([return to Table of Contents](#))

Leveraging of FWS NFHAP Project Funds

This criterion indicates the extent to which an FHP has leveraged FWS NFHAP project funds over the previous three fiscal years. It is measured as a ratio of the total FWS NFHAP project funds a FHP received to the total non-FWS cash or in-kind contributions the FHP secured over the previous three fiscal years. This criterion does not include in-kind partner contributions of staff time for FHP coordination. However, monetary contributions for FHP coordination and staff positions; grants; donations; and in-kind materials and services are taken into account. The intention is to encourage FHPs to secure additional project funds to supplement FWS NFHAP project funds. (Note: Fiscal year refers to federal fiscal year, which begins October 1 and ends September 30, annually.)

Project Completion

This benchmark identifies the percentage of projects completed consistent with the project design (as identified in FIS) in the previous three, four, and five fiscal years. (Note: Some projects are designed to be done over a multi-year period.) This criterion does not apply to FHPs that have not executed a project using FWS NFHAP project support. (Note: Given the funding timeline of the last few years, it will be necessary to calculate the timetable beginning with the previous fiscal year. In many cases funds are not available in time to take action during the current fiscal year).

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

The benchmark applies to projects funded in the previous three fiscal years. Monitoring and evaluation plans help to determine if: 1) the project was completed as designed, 2) the project resulted in the desired habitat effect, and 3) the project produced the desired biological outcome. Plans may be at the project level or may encompass multiple projects across the landscape.

Projects Aligned with FHP Priority Areas/Species

These are defined by the individual FHP in its strategic plan and may be species, system, impairment, or place based. The benchmark identifies the percentage of projects, funded in the previous three years or proposed for the next year, that address these priorities.

FWS Priority Species/Trust Resources

These are species and/or focal areas defined by the FWS for conservation action. Specific priorities will be identified by the Fisheries Management Team. The benchmark identifies the percentage of projects, funded in the previous 3 years or proposed for the next year, that address these priorities.



**Work Plan and Accomplishments Report Guidance and Template
FY16 FWS NFHAP Project Funding Cycle**

Fish Habitat Partnership:

Contact Person Name:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

General Instructions

1. Complete Section 1 if applying for operating support funding, only.
2. Complete Sections 1, 2, and 3 if applying for both stable operational support and competitive, performance-based funds. See attachment to this template for additional guidance and definitions for selected performance criterion.
3. If you have questions about this template please contact your Regional Coordinator.
4. Email one electronic copy of the completed application by 5:00 pm local time, **January 5, 2016** to your respective Regional Coordinator and the National Coordinator (listed below).
5. Incomplete reports will not be considered for funding. Information received after the submission deadline will not be considered.

NFHAP Regional and National Coordinator List

FWS Region	Coordinator	Phone	E-mail	FHPs in Region
1	Jana Grote	503-231-2387	Jana_Grote@fws.gov	- Hawaii FHP - Pacific Marine and Estuarine Partnership
2	Karin Eldridge	505-248-6471	Karin_Eldridge@fws.gov	- Desert FHP
3	Jessica Hogrefe	612-713-5102	Jessica_Hogrefe@fws.gov	- Driftless Area Restoration Effort - Fishers and Farmers Partnership - Great Lakes Basin FHP - Midwest Glacial Lakes Partnership - Ohio River Basin FHP
4	Tripp Boltin	843-819-1229	Walter_Boltin@fws.gov	- Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership
5	Callie McMunigal	304-536-4760	Callie_Mcmunigal@fws.gov	- Atlantic Coastal FHP - Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture
6	Bill Rice	303-236-4219	William_Rice@fws.gov	- Great Plains FHP
7	David Wigglesworth	907-786-3925	David_Wigglesworth@fws.gov	- Kenai Peninsula FHP - Mat-Su Basin Salmon Habitat Partnership - Southwest Alaska Salmon Habitat Partnership
8	Lisa Heki	775-861-6300	Lisa_G_Heki@fws.gov	- California Fish Passage Forum - Western Native Trout Initiative
HQ	Cecilia Lewis	703-358-2102	Cecilia_Lewis@fws.gov	- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Partnership

General Guidance for Completing Section 1. Justification for Stable Operating Support

The intent of Section 1 is to ensure that FHPs receiving operating support are thriving, active organizations making concerted efforts to achieve fish habitat conservation goals and objectives established by both the FHP and National Fish Habitat Action Plan.

Narrative responses should provide an overview of all projects and activities supported by FWS funds and all other sources or in-kind contributions over the previous three federal fiscal years (FYs 2012, 2013, and 2014 or October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2014) and anticipated projects and activities over the next three federal fiscal years (2016, 2017, and 2018 or October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2018).

Project summaries should not be an itemized list of individual projects. Project summaries should instead focus on the associated outputs and outcomes of the habitat conservation projects implemented by the FHP (*e.g. completed ten fish passage projects resulting in X number of miles reopened, link to strategic plan, objective addressed, outcomes, socioeconomic impacts, etc.*)

Activity summaries should focus on salient operational and programmatic activities (*e.g. update strategic plan, improved capacity of FHP, monitoring and assessments, outreach events, socioeconomic impacts, etc.*). Day-to-day FHP activities (*e.g. the number of meetings or teleconferences an FHP representative participated in*) are not pertinent to this performance report and should not be included in this summary.

Additional, supplemental guidance for completing the Annual Work Plan and Accomplishments Report and example narratives can be found in the Appendix section of this document.

Section 1. Justification for Stable Operational Support (maximum 6 pages)

Enter your responses in the space provided below.

General Guidance for Completing Section 2. Accomplishments Report

The purpose of this section is to describe, in detail, the activities of the FHP over the previous three federal fiscal years and how stated goals and objectives were met using FWS NFHAP project funds and other funding and in-kind resources.

Responses for criterion #4, project completion, should include information for projects that received FWS NFHAP project funds over the previous five fiscal years. The previous five fiscal years that will be assessed are FY 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014. This only applies to criterion #4. Responses for all other criteria in this section will adhere to the three fiscal year time frame.

When responding to the requirements in this Section, FHPs should complete the self-assessment checklist, with narrative evidence justifying the performance level selected for each criterion.

Section 2. Accomplishments (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2014)

1. Meet the basic FHP requirements established by the National Fish Habitat Board for strategic planning and assessments

Over the previous three fiscal years, how has the FHP met basic requirements for scientific planning and habitat assessments? (Choose one and provide explanation)

- FHP has coordinated and compiled scientific assessment information on fish habitats within its partnership area (Level 1)
- FHP has identified and has a plan to fill data gaps necessary to refine and complete fish habitat assessments, and incorporates existing habitat assessments into its strategic plan (Level 2)
- FHP has filled data gaps and refined habitat assessments, including climate change considerations, for incorporation into the Science and Data Committee's national assessment (Level 3)

Narrative support: Briefly summarize any assessments and efforts to identify and fill data gaps. Describe how assessment results have been incorporated into strategic plans priorities and project selection process. Provide a link to your strategic plan and/or assessments as appropriate.

6. Leveraging of FWS Project Funds

Over a three year period the FHP leveraged FWS NFHAP funding by a ratio of (Choose one). See attachment for further guidance on responding to this criterion:

- At least 1:1 (Level 1)
- At least 2:1 (Level 2)
- At least 3:1 (Level 3)
- No FWS funds were leveraged

Complete table adding rows for additional projects as needed.

Project Name	FWS NFHAP Funds	Non-FWS Contributions	Other Contributions	Total Project Costs	Funding Partners
Total					

Section 3: Work Plan (1-Year Planning Horizon)

Complete table adding rows for additional projects as needed. This table should include all proposed projects for which you are seeking FY16 FWS NFHAP project funds.

Proposed Projects for FY16 FWS NFHAP Project Funding

FWS Region	State	FONS #	Rank	NFHAP Funds	Partner Funds	Total Cost	NFHAP Conservation Strategy	FWS Climate Objective

7. Strategic Implementation

Percentage of projects that include measurable goals and objectives to address:

- *FHP priority species or priority areas; and/or*
- *Habitat issues for FWS priority species or trust resources*

Choose one, complete the table below, and provide narrative responses describing the measurable goals & objectives (max. 700 characters). Example narrative is provided in Appendix.

- 75% (Level 1)
- 85% (Level 2)
- 95% (Level 3)
- Less than 75%

Complete table adding rows for additional projects as needed.

Project Title	Identify FWS Priority Species / Trust Resources	Identify FHP Priority Species / Area

Enter narrative responses below for each project (max. 700 characters/project)

8. Conservation Actions and Project Outcomes

Percentage of proposed projects with specific conservation actions that will produce desired conservation outcomes and achieve project goals and objectives?

Choose one and provide narrative responses below.

- 50% (Level 1)
- 75% (Level 2)
- 100% (Level 3)
- Less than 50%

Narrative responses (max. 700 characters/project)

Supplemental Guidance for Selected Performance Criterion

1. Benchmarks for the Habitat Assessment criterion performance levels and evaluating FHP achievement of Basic FHP Requirements (Appendix 2, Section 2, Criterion 1 in the approved methodology)

To achieve Performance Level 1 (PL1), an FHP must:

- Coordinate and compile scientific assessment(s) information on priority fish habitats within the FHP's boundaries. Note: FHPs can use an existing assessment(s) performed by others (e.g., NFHP National Habitat Assessment, universities, Recovery Teams, or LCCs) as a starting point or undertake their own assessment(s).

To achieve Performance Level 2 (PL2), FHP must:

- Meet the requirements of PL1.
- Complete FHP specific plan to fill data gaps and to refine and complete fish habitat assessment.
- Prioritize information gaps and approach to fill science and data gaps necessary to refine, complete, and update habitat condition assessments.
- Identify how habitat assessments projects will be solicited and selected within FHP priorities.
- Incorporate existing assessments of habitat conditions and threats as needed into the FHP strategic plan.

To achieve Performance Level 3 (PL3), FHP must:

- Meet the requirements of PL2.
- Information gaps in scientific information and knowledge have been filled and the FHP is proactively sharing this information in a compatible format with the National Science and Data Team for integration into the national assessment and other national needs.
- Incorporate new data on threats, including climate change, into the habitat assessment and project priorities.

2. Additional instruction for determining project completion (found in Appendix 2, Section 2, Criterion 4 of the approved methodology)

On-the-Ground Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Protection Projects

- A project is complete when fully constructed or implemented consistent with the project design and performance measures (i.e., number of stream miles enhanced or restored) are reported in FIS-Accomplishments.
- Basic implementation monitoring (if specified in the original project proposal) is also completed; however, longer term, 1-2 year monitoring, and evaluation (if specified in original project proposal) need not be completed to consider the project complete.

Education and Outreach Projects and Species or Habitat Assessment Projects

- A project is complete when the specified product/deliverable (i.e., a brochure, informational sign, video, assessment report, GIS database, etc.) is produced and received

consistent with that which was described in the original project proposal and performance measures are reported in FIS-Accomplishments.

- If monitoring was specified (typically not for these project types), then basic implementation monitoring (if specified in the original project proposal) is also completed; however, longer term, 1-2 year monitoring, and evaluation (if specified in original project proposal) need not be completed to consider the project complete.

3. Instruction for calculating Leveraging (found in Appendix 2, Section 2, Criterion 6 of the approved methodology)

This criterion indicates the extent to which an FHP has leveraged FWS NFHAP project funds over the previous three fiscal years. The intent is to measure actions by FHPs to secure additional partner funds to supplement projects that receive NFHAP funding. Leveraging is measured as a ratio of the total FWS NFHAP project funds (this includes stable operational support, performance-based funds, and indirect NFHAP technical project support an FHP received) to the total non-FWS cash or in-kind contributions the FHP secured to supplement the NFHAP funds it received over the previous three fiscal years. (Note: Fiscal year refers to federal fiscal year, which begins October 1 and ends September 30, annually).

Leveraged funds and in-kind contributions for projects that receive FWS NFHAP funds includes, but is not limited to, the following types of monetary and in-kind contributions:

- Monetary contributions for FHP coordination and staff positions
- Grants
- Private foundation funds
- Documented donations; and in-kind materials and services
- Funds where FWS funds are co-mingled with other non-Service funding sources (e.g. National Fish and Wildlife Foundation)
- Non-appropriated funds managed by the FWS (e.g. Coastal Impact Assistance Program, National Coastal Wetland Conservation Grant program)

Leveraging cannot include:

- FWS appropriated funding and their associated matching funds or in-kind services (e.g. Service funds and partner contributions associated with the National Fish Passage, Coastal, and Partners for Fish and Wildlife programs, LCCs, etc.)
- Any funds raised by the FHP for general operations or projects where FWS NFHAP funds are not used

4. Brief project summary for each prioritized project (examples included below)

FHPs must present the suite of ranked projects proposed for FWS NFHAP funding in the current fiscal year and describe how these projects demonstrate strategic use of NFHAP funds and will achieve desired conservation outcomes.

Question 7 - Measurable Goals & Objectives (Max. 700 characters): This project replaces one barrier to fish passage and opens 2.8 miles of upstream habitat to juvenile Coho and Chinook

salmon. The crossing has been identified as a partial barrier to juvenile salmon by the State. An estimated 8-10 foot embedded culvert will replace the existing culvert. The FHP ranked this culvert in the top 16 culverts to be replaced for fish barrier issues. The project partner and FHP members, the City of Caribou Creek and local Soil District, have expressed the need to construct this project and has funding to support the project. This project addresses Objective 4 in the FHP strategic plan. It targets interjurisdictional fish, an FWS Trust Species, and a species priority for the FHP. It is being implemented in the Anchor River watershed - a priority watershed for the FHP.

Question 8 - Conservation Actions & Project Outcomes (Max. 700 characters): Barrier removal will make 2.8 miles of upstream habitat accessible for chinook and coho salmon. The project will be designed using stream simulation standards/techniques, proven techniques to accommodate fish and other aquatic species. The project partner has an established fish passage program and has considerable capacity to implement the project and achieve project goals. The state fish and game agency will evaluate juvenile use of the reopened habitat pursuant to the state's fish passage monitoring plan.

Title: Communications Committee Update/Marketing Update

Desired outcomes:

- Board awareness of recent 501(c)(3) and Marketing and Branding Team activities.
- Board awareness of progress on Communications Plan (3-5yr) development.

Background: The National Fish Habitat Fund Board is developing a fund raising strategy and is anticipating on meeting again in person in late winter or early spring 2016. The website for the National Fish Habitat Fund, marketed as Beyond the Pond is set to go live in late January. The Marketing team will have content management system training in mid-January.

The Communications Committee will present a Communications Plan for 2016-2020 at their March 2016 meeting. The Plan will cover how our partnership initiative will communicate to our partners and wide variety of audiences on major program developments including the National Assessment and Waters to Watch Campaign. The update will also focus on linkages between communications efforts of the Partnership and Beyond the Pond non-profit.

Briefing Book Materials:

None

Title: Executive Leadership Team (ELT) Update

Desired outcome(s): Board understanding of ELT National Fish Habitat Board member decisions

Background:

During the month of December, the Executive Leadership Team approved nominations from the Northeast and Southeast AFWA regions via email. The following individuals were appointed:

- Peter Aarrestad, Director, Inland Fisheries Division, Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (NEAFWA)
- Ross Melinchuk, Deputy Executive Director, Natural Resources, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (SEAFWA)

The ELT will convene via conference call on Thursday, February 4th to discuss how to move forward with respect to the NFWF seat.

Briefing Book Materials:

Tab 5b Board Member List and Terms

NFHP Board Membership (*January 2016*)

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Representing	Next Review
Aarrestad	Peter	CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection	State Agency - NEAFWA	July 2018
Allen	Stan	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission	At large- Commercial fishing	June 2016
Andrews	Michael	The Nature Conservancy	At large - Conservation	June 2016
Beard	Doug	US Geological Survey	Federal Agency	July 2018
Bigford	Tom	American Fisheries Society	American Fisheries Society	July 2018
Boyd	Douglass	Sportfishing and Boating Partnership Council	At large- Sportfishing	July 2017
Champeau	Tom	FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	State Agency	July 2018
Fosburgh	Whit	Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership	At large- Sportfishing	July 2017
Gilinsky	Ellen	US Environmental Protection Agency	Federal Agency	June 2016
Harper	Rob	USDA Forest Service	Federal Agency	July 2018
Leonard	Mike	American Sportfishing Association	At large-Sportfishing	June 2016
Melinchuk	Ross	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	State Agency - SEAFWA	July 2018
Moore	Chris	Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council	At large- Commercial fishing	October 2016
Myers	Kelley	IA Department of Natural Resources Fisheries Bureau	State Agency - MAFWA	July 2018
Schriever	Ed	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	State Agency - WAFWA	July 2018
Skates	Ron	Native American Fish and Wildlife Society	Tribal	July 2018
Stone	Sean	Coastal Conservation Association	At large - Sportfishing	July 2017
Wood	Chris	Trout Unlimited	At large - Conservation	July 2017
NA		National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	July 2015
Board members serving by virtue of their offices				
Ashe	Dan	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Federal Agency	
Rauch	Sam	NOAA Fisheries Service	Federal Agency	
Regan	Ron	Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies	AFWA – Executive Director	

National Fish Habitat Board (NFHB) Committees: Purpose and Membership

Communications Committee

The Communications Committee's role is to support the partnership by sustaining critical communications needs and initiatives. The Communications Committee plays an essential role in crafting the messages that raise awareness about the partnership and help build a community of support for fish habitat conservation.

Members:

Lindsay Gardner – SARP
Ryan Roberts – AFWA/NFHB staff
Debbie Hart – SEAK FHP
Jim Harper – NOAA contract
Cecilia Lewis – USFWS/NFHB staff
Joe Starinchak – USFWS
Mike Leonard – ASA/NFHB Member

Science and Data Committee

The Science and Data Committee's purpose is to provide scientific and data management expertise and oversight to advance the goals and objectives of the National Fish Habitat Board in a scientifically sound and strategic manner.

Members:

Jose Barrios – USFWS
Jennifer Bayer – USGS
Timothy Birdsong – TX PWD/SARP
Robin Carlson – PSMFC/CFPP
Mary Davis – SIFN/SARP
Nicole Eiden – AZ G&F
Pam Fuller – USGS
Daniel Isaak – USFS
Pete Jacobson – MN DNR
Jeff Kopaska – IA DNR
Thom Litts – GA DNR
Jonathan Mawdsley – AFWA
James McKenna, Jr. – USGS
Moe Nelson – NOAA-NOS
Doug Norton – EPA
Criag Paukert – USGS
Cecil Rich – USFWS
Bruce Vogt – NOAA-NMFS

Committee Technical Advisors

Christopher Estes – Chalk Board Enterprise LCC
Jonathan Higgins - TNC
Kay McGraw – NOAA-NMFS
Priya Nanjappa - AFWA
Scott Sowa - TNC

Board Liaison

Stan Allen – PSMFC/NFHB Member

Marine Assessment Team Lead

Kristan Blackhart – NOAA contract

Inland Assessment Team Lead

Dana Infante – MI State University

Co-Chairs

Gary Whelan – MI DNR
Peter Ruhl – USGS

Partnerships Committee

The Partnerships Committee serves as a forum for preliminary discussions, fact-finding, and formulating recommendations for Board actions that affect Fish Habitat Partnerships.

Members:

David Wigglesworth – USFWS

Heidi Keuler – USFWS/FFP

Jeff Boxrucker – Reservoir FHP

Lisa Havel – ACFHP

Scott Robinson - SARP

Kayla Barrett – USFWS/Desert FHP

Chairs

Stan Allen – PSMFC/NFHB Member

Steve Perry - EBTJV

Executive Leadership Team

Members of the National Fish Habitat Board are appointed by the Executive Leadership Team (ELT), which has final responsibility for appointment and, if necessary, removal of all Board members, except those serving by virtue of their office.

Members:

President and Executive Director of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior

FHP Performance Evaluation Review Team (2015)

Purpose is to conduct a review of FHP Performance Evaluation submissions and provide findings to the Board.

Members:

Tom Champeau – FWCC/NFHB Member

Stan Allen – PSMFC/NFHB Member

Doug Austen – AFS

Peter Ruhl – USGS/NFHB staff

Gary Whelan – MI DNR/NFHB staff

Emily Greene – NOAA contract/ NFHB staff

NFHP Legislative Team

The primary focus of the NFHP Legislative Team is to push for passage of National Fish Habitat Conservation Act legislation.

Members:

Steve Moyer – TU/Fund BOD/Past NFHB Proxy

Mike Leonard – ASA/NFHB Member

Jen Mock-Schaeffer – AFWA

Gary Kania – Congressional Sportsman Foundation (contributor)

Steve Kline – TRCP/NFHB Member Proxy

Marketing Team

Charged with leading the creation of an educational and outreach campaign to raise awareness of the critically important aquatic habitat conservation work being implemented through the National Fish Habitat Partnership.

Members:

Joe Starinchak – USFWS

Therese Thompson – WNTI

Kelly Hepler – SD GFP/Fund BOD

Johnny LeCoq - Fishpond

Eli Gerson – Design and Image

Ryan Roberts – AFWA/Board staff

Related National Fish Habitat Partnership Groups: Purpose and Membership

Federal Caucus

Several federal agencies contribute to the work of the Partnership, not just the agencies that are represented on the Board. The Federal Caucus was created in 2005 to facilitate interaction among federal agencies.

Members:

Bureau of Reclamation – Arthur Coykendall, Cathy Cunningham

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management- Megan Davidson, Jake Levenson

Bureau of Land Management – David Hu

Environmental Protection Agency – Doug Norton

Forest Service – Nathaniel Gillespie, John Rothlisberger, Dan Shively

National Park Service – Alan Ellsworth, John Wullschleger

NOAA Fisheries – Emily Greene (contract)

US Department of Agriculture – Craig Goodwin, David Hoge
US Fish and Wildlife Service – Cecilia Lewis, Susan Wells, Jason Goldberg, Steven Krentz, Callie McMunigal, Gordon Smith

US Geological Survey – Andrea Ostroff

US Army Corps of Engineers – David Smith

NFHP Coalition

The Partner Coalition serves as an outlet for information-sharing on priorities, projects, and successes, while helping the Board to build a grassroots network of support for fish habitat conservation. The Coalition consists of individuals and organizations who sign up through the web site (fishhabitat.org).