

NATIONAL FISH HABITAT ACTION PLAN

Board Meeting - October 12-14, 2010

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

Portland, OR



NATIONAL
FISH HABITAT
ACTION PLAN



AGENDA BOOK

Tabs for October 12-14, 2010 Board meeting:

Directions (Informational) – Tab 1

Board Members (Informational) – Tab 2

Approval of agenda (Action Item) – Tab 3

Approval of June 2010 and August 2010 (Conference Call) meeting minutes (Action Item) – Tab 4

Legislative update (Informational) – Tab 5

Revised Charter – Tab 6

FWS funded NFHAP projects (2006-2009) (Informational) – Tab 7

Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership update (Informational) – Tab 8

Pacific Marine & Estuarine Partnership update (Informational) – Tab 8

North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership update (Informational) – Tab 8

NFHAP Budget (Informational) – Tab 9

FWS Policy Initiatives regarding FHP'S (Action Item) – Tab 10

Communications Update (Informational) – Tab 11

Science and Data Update/Assessment Update (Informational) – Tab 12

2010 NFHAP "Status of Fish Habitats" Report (Informational) – Tab 13

NFHAP Prioritization Factors (Informational) – Tab 14

*Supplemental items found in back flap of briefing book

***Building Tribal and NFHAP Relations** (Informational)

***Report out from facilitated strategy session** (Discussion/Action)

TAB 1


Hotel and Board Meeting Directions and Things to do in Portland, OR:

Hotel:

Courtyard (Marriott) Portland Downtown/Lloyd Center
435 NE Wasco St
Portland, Oregon 97232
Phone: 1-503-234-3200
Fax: 1-503-234-1836
Toll-free: 1-800-321-2211


Hotel Information:

<http://www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/pdxcl-courtyard-portland-downtown-lloyd-center/>



Meeting Location:
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC)
729 NE Oregon St., Ste. 200
Portland, Oregon 97232
Phone: (503) 238-0667
fax: (503) 235-4228

(CRITFC) website:
<http://www.critfc.org/index.html>



Walking Directions from hotel to meeting at (CRITFC):

8 Minute Walk:

- Depart Hotel heading towards SR-99E North/NE Grand Ave
- Turn right onto SR-99E North/NE Grand Ave
- Turn left onto NE Oregon St (*Land Rover Dealership on Corner*)
- Arrive at 729 NE Oregon St, Portland, OR 97232-2174 on the left

Meeting Note:

The Board will meet in the offices of the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Council Offices located at:
729 NE Oregon St., Ste. 200

The **Facilitated Strategy Session** for all attendees will convene at 8:30 am on Tuesday (Oct. 12) and the Board meeting wrap-up at 4:30 pm on Thursday. **Please RSVP** to rsvp@fishhabitat.org if you are interested in attending the NFHAP Board Meeting.

In case of any problems finding the meeting facility, please call Ryan Roberts @ 202-329-8882

Hotel Logistics and Travel (to and from Courtyard Marriot)

*Courtyard offers free shuttle service within 3 mile radius of the hotel (includes most of downtown Portland)

Hotel Parking:

On-site parking, fee: \$12 daily

Valet parking, fee: \$19 daily

Off-site parking, fee: \$0.75 hourly

Area Airports

Portland - PDX - Phone: (503) 460 4040

- Hotel direction: 9 miles W
- Driving Directions: I-205 South to I-84 West. Follow I-84 West to the exit #1 (Lloyd Blvd). Continue straight on Lloyd Blvd to Grand Ave. Turn right on Grand Ave. Left on Wasco St to hotel.

*This hotel does not provide shuttle service from Airport.

Transportation Services (from airport):

- Portland Light Rail (MAX) Red Line (Hotel is at Convention Center Stop) fare: \$2.35
- Blue Star Shuttle; fee: \$14.00 (one way); reservation required
- Estimated taxi fare: \$30.00 (one way)

Restaurants near hotel:

On-site:

Charley's On Grand

American - Casual, fresh continental food & drink

* Open for breakfast, lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-382-3148

Nearby

Stanfords (0.3 miles)

American Upscale steaks & seafood with Northwest flair

* Open for lunch and dinner

* Phone: 1-503-335-0811

Red Robin (0.2 miles)

American Burgers

* Open for lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-231-9223

Portland City Grill (1.5 miles)

Steakhouse "Northwest"s finest upscale dining featuring steaks and seafood. Sushi menu available

* Open for lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-450-0030

Jake's Famous Crawfish (1 miles)

Seafood - Portland landmark restaurant & bar, a must-eat

* Open for lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-226-1419

Newport Seafood Grill (0.5 miles)

Seafood - One of Portland's newest concepts, the Newport Seafood Grill offers you an upscale casual atmosphere and a large menu of fresh seafood and sushi. Each day there are over a dozen seafood items on the fresh sheet, making it one of the best seafood spots.

* Open for lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-493-0100

Milo's City Cafe (0.5 miles)

American - Known for outstanding breakfasts & lunches and have gotten a tremendous following for dinners. Serving interesting, creative & affordable Northwest cuisine - including fresh seafood, quality meats, interesting pastas and a variety of sandwiches & salads.

* Open for breakfast, lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-288-6456

Cadillac Cafe (0.5 miles)

American - This spot produces the fun factor with a neon pink sign, light-pink walls, an open kitchen and a '61 Caddy safely locked behind a wood- and glass-paneled garage door. Weekend brunch offers staples like a variety of pancakes, steak & eggs, and french toast

* Open for breakfast and lunch

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-287-4750

Pastini Pastaria (0.5 miles)

Italian - The bustling dining room with high ceilings, vintage Italian ad posters and a partially open kitchen has all the elements of a neighborhood favorite. A long list of pastas is split between traditional dishes & creative bowls are available.

* Open for lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-288-4300

Mama Mia Trattoria (1.5 miles)

Italian - The heart and soul of their cooking is homey, honest, unpretentious, and homemade. Robust food served without frills or fuss. Everything is made from scratch, in their kitchen, using the best possible ingredients. Veal is free-range & naturally fed.

* Open for dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-295-6464

Mother's Bistro & Bar (1.5 miles)

American - Mother's Bistro & Bar serves up slow-cooked food in the heart of downtown Portland. Featuring authentic cooking from mothers around the world, signature dishes include pot roast, meat loaf, chicken and dumplings, crab cakes and more.

* Open for breakfast, lunch and dinner

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-464-1122

Pour Wine Bar & Bistro (1 miles)

Friendly neighborhood locale that serves up small plates & fine wines. Patrons with little experience in wine will find a knowledgeable staff offering suggestions & samples while the connoisseur will find eclectic favorites such as Turley by the glass.

* Dress code: Casual

* Phone: 1-503-288-7687

TAB 2

National Fish Habitat Board meeting Oct 12-14, 2010

National Fish Habitat Board Members

Kelly Hepler, <i>Chair</i>	Alaska
John Frampton	Southeast AFWA
Steve Perry	Northeast AFWA
Joe Larscheid for Rich Leopold	Midwest AFWA
Mike Stone	Western AFWA
Ron Regan	AFWA
Eric Schwaab	NOAA/NMFS
Bryan Arroyo <i>for</i> Rowan Gould	DOI/FWS
David Troutt	Tribal, Nisqually Indian Tribe
Krystyna Wolniakowski	NFWF
Steve Moyer <i>for</i> Chris Wood	Conservation/Academic, TU
Michael Andrews	Conservation/Academic, TNC
Doug Boyd	Conservation/Academic, SFBPC
Stan Moberly	Conservation/Academic, AFS
Stan Allen <i>for</i> Randy Fisher	At large/Interstate Fishery Commission, PSMFC
Bob Mahood	At large/Fishery Management Council, SAFMC
Gordon Robertson	At large, ASA
Chris Horton	At large, BASS/ESPN

Also participating:

Anne Zimmermann	USDA FS
-----------------	---------

Board Member Contact Information

Kelly Hepler - Chair

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
333 Raspberry Rd.
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599
Ph: 907-465-6184
Kelly.Hepler@alaska.gov

Stephen G. Perry

Chief, Inland Fisheries Division
NH Fish and Game Department
11 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301
603-271-1745
603-271-1438 (fax)
stephen.perry@wildlife.nh.gov

John E. Frampton

Director
South Carolina Department of Natural
Resources
PO Box 167
Columbia, SC 29202
framptonj@dnr.sc.gov

Rich Leopold

Director
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
502 East 9th St.
Wallace Building - 4th Floor
Des Moines, IA 50319
Ph: 515-281-5385
richard.leopold@dnr.state.ia.us

Mike Stone

Chief of Fisheries
Wyoming Game and Fish Department
5400 Bishop Blvd.
Cheyenne, WY 82006
Ph: 307-777-4559
Mike.Stone@wgf.state.wy.us

Ron Regan

Executive Director
Association of Fish and Wildlife
Agencies
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington D.C. 20001
Ph: 202-624-7890
rregan@fishwildlife.org

Rowan Gould

(Acting) Director
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20240
rowan_gould@fws.gov

Eric Schwaab

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries
NOAA Fisheries Service
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910
eric.schwaab@noaa.gov

David Troutt

Nisqually Indian Tribe
3181 Brown Loop
DuPont, Washington 98327
staff@nisquallylandtrust.org

Stan Moberly

American Fisheries Society
Northwest Marine Technology, Inc.
955 Malin Lane, SW
Olympia, WA 98501
Ph: 907-736-2251
stan.moberly@nmt.us

Mike Andrews

Vice President for Ecosystem Services
The Nature Conservancy
6114 Fayetteville Road, Suite 109
Durham, NC 27713
Ph: 919-484-7857 ext 117
mandrews@tnc.org

Chris Wood

President and Chief Executive Officer
Trout Unlimited
1300 N. 17th St., Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22209-2404
Ph: 703-284-9405

Krystyna Wolniakowski

Director, Western Partnership Office
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
806 SW Broadway, Suite 750
Portland, OR 97205
Ph: 503-702-0245
Wolniakowski@NFWF.ORG

Gordon Robertson

Vice President
American Sportfishing Association
225 Reinekers Lane, Suite 420
Alexandria VA 22314
Ph: 703-519-9691
grobertson@asafishing.org

Douglass Boyd

douglassboyd@yahoo.com

Randy Fisher

Executive Director
Pacific States Marine Fisheries
Commission
205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 100
Portland, Oregon 97202
Ph: 503-595-3100
Randy_Fisher@psmfc.org

Bob Mahood

Executive Director
South Atlantic Fishery Management
Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405
Ph: 843-571-4366
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Chris Horton

National Assembly of Sportsmen's
Caucuses
Regional Director
249 Fletcher Lane
Bismarck, AR 71929
Ph: (501) 865-1475
chris@sportsmenslink.org

Anne Zimmermann

USDA, Forest Service
Director, Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Air
and Rare plants
Sydney R. Yates Building
201 14th Street, SW Room 3SE
Washington, DC 20250-1121
azimmermann@fs.fed.us

TAB 3

National Fish Habitat Board meeting

**Hosted by
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
729 NE Oregon St., Ste. 200
Portland, Oregon 9723**

(Draft agenda)

Tuesday, October 12

8:30 – 5:00 Facilitated Strategy Session

National Fish Habitat Board & Staff
NFHAP FHP Representatives & Coordinators
State Fish Chiefs & other State Representatives
US FWS ARDs/NOAA Fisheries ARAs
NOAA / FWS Regional NFHAP Coordinators

6:30 - Social Hours.

REGULAR BOARD MEETING CONVENES

Wednesday, Oct 13

(AM) 8:00 – 8:30 Coffee

8:30 – 8:50 Welcome and introductions Kelly Hepler, Board Chair
Paul Lumley, Executive Director (CRITFC)

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of agenda – Tab 3

Approval of June 2010 meeting minutes – Tab 4

8:50 – 9:10 Tuesday Wrap-up Discussion Kelly Hepler
INFORMATIONAL

9:10 – 9:30 Legislative update Gordon Robertson
INFORMATIONAL – Tab 5

9:30 – 10:00 FWS-funded NFHAP projects (2006-2009) Tom Busiahn
INFORMATIONAL – Tab 7

10:00 – 10:30 Building Tribal and NFHAP Relations David Troutt
INFORMATIONAL AND DISCUSSION – Tab (supplemental)

10:30 – 10:45 Break

10:45 – 11:15 Update from the Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership
INFORMATIONAL – Tab 8 Gordon Smith, US FWS

11:15 – 11:45 Update from Pacific Marine & Estuarine Partnership
INFORMATIONAL – Tab 8 Dan Shively, US FWS/Korie Schaeffer, NOAA Fisheries

11:45 – 12:45 Lunch

12:45 – 1:15 Update from the N. American Salmon Stronghold Partnership
INFORMATIONAL – Tab 8 Mark Trenholm, Wild Salmon Center

1:15 – 2:15 Report out from facilitated strategy session Kelly Hepler
DISCUSSION/ACTION: potential adoption of recommendations – Tab (supplemental)

2:15 – 2:45 NFHAP Budget Ron Regan
INFORMATIONAL – Tab 9

2:45 – 3:00 Break

3:00 – 4:15 FWS Policy Initiatives regarding FHPs Bryan Arroyo
ACTION: Concurrence from Board – Tab 10

4:15 – 5:00 Communications Update Ryan Roberts
INFORMATIONAL – Tab 11

Thursday, Oct 14

8:00 – 8:30 Coffee

8:30 – 10:00 Science and Data Update/Assessment Update

INFORMATIONAL – Tab 12

Gary Whelan/Andrea Ostroff

10:00 – 10:15 Break

10:15 – 11:15 2010 NFHAP “Status of Fish Habitats” Report Susan-Marie Stedman

INFORMATIONAL/DISCUSSION – Tab 13

11:15 – 11:45 NFHAP Prioritization Factors

INFORMATIONAL - Tab 14

Gary Whelan

11:45 – 12:15 Revision of NFHAP (Update for 2011)

INFORMATIONAL

Kelly Hepler

12:45 – 1:00 Final Business/Meeting Wrap-up/Next meeting/Vice-Chair Appt.

ACTION ITEM (nominations and vote for vice-chair)

Kelly Hepler

1:00 - Adjourn

TAB 4



Meeting Minutes

National Fish Habitat Board Meeting June 9-10, 2010 Silver Spring, Maryland

Board Members Present:

Kelly Hepler, Chair
Doug Austen, Vice-chair
Mike Stone
Ron Regan
Eric Schwaab
Joe Moran *for* Rowan Gould
Steve Moyer
Mike Andrews
Stan Moberly
Stan Allen *for* Randy Fisher
Mike Leonard *for* Gordon Robertson
Chris Horton

Key Discussion Items:

Administration support for National Fish Habitat Action Plan
Casting Call 2011
2010 NFHAP Objectives and Deliverables
Board Development
Board Budget

Decisions Made:

- 1) Stan Moberly moved to approve the draft agenda revised to exclude the agenda item on the revised White Paper on the Assessment and Decision Support System. Ron Regan seconded. Passed unanimously.
- 2) Steve Moyer moved to approve the draft minutes from the March 2010 meeting. Joe Larscheid seconded. Passed unanimously.
- 3) Doug Austen moved to establish a sub-committee to evaluate the cost and feasibility of co-sponsoring with AFFTA a Hill reception as part of Casting Call 2011. Stan Moberly seconded. Passed unanimously. Kelly Hepler and Ryan Roberts were appointed to the subcommittee.
- 4) Doug Austen moved to establish a working group of about 4 Board members and appropriate staff to reach out one more time to the FHPS to get their input on the allocation options for FY11 project funds, report back to the Board by July 15, and facilitate a Board decision by August 1. Ron Regan seconded. Passed unanimously.



NATIONAL
FISH HABITAT
ACTION PLAN

Follow up Actions:

- 1) Revise charter to allow Board members to carry no more than one additional proxy vote, approve revision at October Board meeting.
Who: Susan-Marie Stedman When: Sept 30, 2010
- 2) Coordinate high-level management attention to Executive Order by DOI/FWS, DOC/NOAA, and USDA.
Who: Ron Regan
- 3) Check with Tom Sadler on a potentially interested staff person in CEQ.
Who: Ryan Roberts
- 4) Get Board members web link to America's Great Outdoors web site, and info on listening sessions.
Who: Ryan Roberts When: June 16, 2010 (done) and ongoing
- 5) Write letter from Board on connections between AGO and NFHAP, emphasizing the science basis of NFHAP.
Who: Ryan Roberts and Gary Whelan When: July 30, 2010
- 6) Talk to Stan Allen, Steve Moyer, and Joe Larscheid about serving on the working group to develop recommendations to DOI on FY 11 funding allocation. Ask Joe to lead the group. (Scott Robinson will also serve as SEAFWA rep)
Who: Kelly Hepler When: ASAP
- 7) Send Board e-mail to get their thoughts on socioeconomic factors to consider in the Decision Tool.
Who: Susan-Marie and Gary Whelan When: September 10, 2010
- 8) Write Executive Status Report on 2010 NFHAP accomplishments with talking points for Board members.
Who: Ryan Roberts When: to be released in late September 2010
- 9) Ask Mike Stone to head a workgroup consisting of himself, Krystyna Wolniakowski, and David Troutt to develop draft descriptions of the roles of those involved in NFHAP. To be included: Board members, Board chair, Board Vice-chair, Board staff, Committee members, Committee chairs, FHP coordinators, Partner Coalition members, and others as they occur to the working group.
Who: Kelly When: ASAP, to be ready for the October Board meeting
- 10) Put together a detailed timeline for the 2010 report, including review by Board members and FHPs.
Who: Susan-Marie When: June 25, 2010



NATIONAL
FISH HABITAT
ACTION PLAN

- 11) Develop process for revising Action Plan.
Who: Tom Busiahn When: to be discussed by Board at October meeting.
- 12) Draft a Board letter to Interior & Commerce asking they include funds for NFHAP in their 2012 budget requests.
Who: Ryan Roberts When: ASAP



NATIONAL
FISH HABITAT
 ACTION PLAN

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Meeting Location: Conference Call		Date: Aug 25, 2010
Members Present: Kelly Hepler, NFH Board Chair Steve Perry (NEAFWA) John Frampton (SEAFWA) Ron Regan (AFWA) Stuart Leon (FWS) Proxy for: Rowan Gould (FWS) Tom Bigford (NOAA) Proxy for: Eric Schwaab (NOAA) Stan Moberly Mike Andrews Gordon Robertson Chris Horton Ron Dunlap (FS) Proxy for: Anne Zimmermann (FS) *11 Board members total on call (8 needed for quorum)	Staff Present: Andrea Ostroff Tom Busiahn Christopher Estes Ryan Roberts Gary Whelan Other participants: John DeLapp, FWS Steve Klosiewski, FWS Maureen Gallagher, FWS Stewart Jacks, FWS Kayla Barrett, FWS, DFHP coordinator Bob Clarke, FWS, WNTI Steering Committee Joe Moran, FWS Bill Taylor, Michigan State Univ	
Members Absent: Mike Stone Steve Moyer David Troutt Krystyna Wolniakowski Randy Fischer Bob Mahood	Next mtg date: October 12-14, 2010 Portland, OR	
Key Discussion Items: Will need to name new MWAFWA representative on the Board (replacing Rich Leopold-took position with FWS) Will need to name new Vice-chair for Fish Habitat Board - Nominations Committee (See Below) Andrea Ostroff replacing Doug Beard as Board Staff (named as Science & Data Co-chair) FHP Funding options for 2011 2010 Status of Fish Habitats Report Timeline Board Development Day (October Board Meeting) Tuesday Oct. 12		

Decisions Made:

FHP Funding options for 2011 discussion:

Motion (Steve Perry) for a Board recommendation to the FWS regarding allocating FY11 NFHAP funding for local projects be the following:

That the amount of FWS NFHAP funding allocated to each Fish Habitat Partnership for local projects remain at the FY10 level with the exception that the amount allocated to SARP, EBTJV, and WNTI be reduced collectively by \$180,904, so that this amount can be evenly split and allocated to Fishers & Farmers and California Fish Passage Forum.

This means that SARP, EBTJV, and WNTI would each be allocated \$542,715 in FY11 funding rather than \$603,015 and Fishers & Farmers and California Fish Passage Forum would each receive \$90,452 in funding assistance.

I further the motion by having the Board recommend to the FWS that up to \$90,452 of the FY11 NFHAP Funding allocated to FHPs for local projects be available to support FHP operational needs.

- Steve Perry move to approve recommendation/ Ron Regan Seconded
 - Motion Passes 4 (yes) to 3 (no), 3 abstain votes (FS, FWS, NOAA)
Kelly Hepler (did not vote)

Vice-Chair to be named at Board meeting in Portland, OR.

- Nominations Committee formed – Members: (**Ron Regan, Stan Moberly, Mike Andrews**)

2010 Status of Fish Habitats Report timeline (Board to give flexibility to timeline of the release of the status report, per assessment accuracy and timelines of information received for report. (Further discussion on this topic at Board meeting in Portland)

Follow up Actions:	Who	By when:
1) Nominations Committee to convene	Ron Regan, Stan Moberly, Mike Andrews	Before October meeting
2)		
3)		
4)		

5)		
----	--	--


Status and Results of FWS-funded NFHAP projects 2006-2009

A report to the
National Fish Habitat Board
October 13, 2010



FWS Funds for NFHAP


- \$7.153M in FY 2010
- Conservation projects, partnership development, and Board support
- Cost-share on projects >2.8 : 1
- \$2M for NFHAP projects included in Recovery Act



■ Appropriated ■ Recovery Act
■ Requested

FWS funds for NFHAP in 2010

- \$7.153M in FY 2010
- National: staff, Board priorities (science, communications)
- Regional: coordination & FHP support
- Local projects: Address priorities of FHPs



Projects Approved 2006-2009

	No. of projects	FWS funds	Match	No. of states
2006	24	\$812,625	\$1,227,940	15
2007	40	\$1,760,000	\$6,091,024	18
2008	72	\$3,200,000	\$7,800,000	31
2009	52	\$2,746,100	\$4,715,772	26
	188	\$8,518,725	\$19,834,736	36

FWS funds in 2008 & 2009 include \$246,100 for Interior's "Healthy Lands Initiative" in the Green River basin, Wyoming. These projects are not included in the rest of this analysis.


Projects by FHP 2006-2009

FWS Region	Fish Habitat Partnership							
	DARE	EBTJV	Mat-Su	SARP	SWAK	WNTI	Demo	TOTAL
1-Pacific						12	1	13
2-Southwest				1		7	1	9
3-Great Lakes/Big Rivers	37			1			3	41
4-Southeast		6		29				35
5-Northeast		34		1				35
6-Mountain/Prairie						14		14
7-Alaska			29		2	1		32
8-Pacific Southwest						5	1	6
TOTAL	37	40	29	32	2	39	6	185

Project Status Categories


- **Complete**: For habitat restoration projects, the habitat work is complete -- follow-up assessment may be ongoing.
- **Ongoing**: Project has been started, but is not complete.
- **Not done**: Project has not been started.
- **Unknown**: Records do not document the status of the project.

Status of NFHAP Projects 2006-2009




NFHAP Projects 2006-2009

Status by Year (%)




NFHAP Projects 2006-2009


Status by Partnership




NFHAP Barrier Projects 2006-2009



NFHAP Instream & Riparian Projects 2006-2009



NFHAP Assessment Projects 2006-2009




All Performance Measures 2006-2009 NFHAP Projects


	# of barriers removed or bypassed	# stream miles reopened	# of instream miles restored or enhanced	# riparian miles restored or enhanced	# of wetland acres restored or enhanced	# of upland acres restored or enhanced	# of habitat assessments	# of population assessments	# of recovery or mgmt tasks implemented
Complete	19	115.94	354.945	87.93	314.4	138.94	67	275	56
Ongoing	19	78.05	176.67	23.4	25,250.5	745.5	82	25	38
TOTAL	38	193.99	531.615	111.33	25,564.9	884.44	149	300	94



Funds reported spent on completed NFHAP projects 2006-2009



Funds reported for ongoing NFHAP projects, 2006-2009



What's next?

- This is a “snapshot” that will change as projects are completed.
- Recent programming has improved FWS database for tracking habitat projects.
- Need geo-referencing (e.g. lat-long) for past & new projects to display on NFHAP mapper.
- Need continuing coordination with S&D Committee for seamless data management.

TAB 8

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP



The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership seeks to cooperatively develop and implement conservation projects to benefit native aquatic life and sustainable uses of streams, estuaries, and nearshore marine habitats through the support and participation of government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and communities.

Mr. Kelly Hepler, Chair
National Fish Habitat Board
c/o Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
444 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 725
Washington, DC 20001

Mr. Hepler:

The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership (FHP) was awarded recognition as a fish habitat partnership at the National Fish Habitat Board meeting on March 5, 2009. At that time, recognition by the Board included the recommendation that the Hawaii FHP include coastal marine and coral reef habitats within the scope of partnership aquatic habitat restoration activities. The scope of activities of the partnership has since expanded to include an increasing focus on coastal marine and coral reef conservation in waters of the main Hawaiian Islands.

On behalf of the partnership Steering Committee, I am pleased to submit the Hawaii FHP Strategic Plan. The plan identifies a number of goals and priority objectives that the partnership will pursue in developing and implementing aquatic habitat restoration in inland and coastal marine waters of Hawaii. We look forward to sharing results of our activities with the Board as we work to achieve the local goals of our partnership and contribute to support of the national strategies of the National Fish Habitat Action Plan.

Sincerely,

Gordon Smith
Coordinator,
Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP

STRATEGIC PLAN



September 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership Steering Committee	iii
Executive Summary	iv
I. Introduction	1
II. Vision and Mission of the Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership.....	4
III. Coastal Marine, Stream and Estuary Resources of Hawaii	5
IV. Integrating Conservation Planning for Aquatic Habitats <i>Mauka To Makai</i>	11
V. Goals and Objectives of the Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership.....	12
VI. Strategy Implementation.....	12
Appendix I – Geographic Focus Areas	20
Appendix II – Partners List.....	21
Appendix II – Organizational Structure.....	23

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP STEERING COMMITTEE

Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership Coordinator:

Gordon Smith
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office

Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership Steering Committee:

Bob Nishimoto
Division of Aquatic Resources
Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources

Dean Uyeno
Commission on Water Resource Management
Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources

Gerry Davis
National Marine Fisheries Services
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Gregory Koob
Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Linda Koch
Environmental Planning Office
Hawaii Department of Health

Rueben Wolff
Water Resources Division
U.S. Geological Survey

Makaala Kaaumoana
Hanalei American Heritage River
Program

Wendy Wiltse
Pacific Islands Contact Office
Environmental Protection Agency

Richard McKenzie
Institute of Pacific Islands Forestry
U.S. Forest Service

Kaeo Duarte
Kamehameha Schools

Megan Webster
Maui Land and Pineapple Inc.

Janet Ashman
Hawaii Farm Bureau

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership is composed of a diverse group of stakeholders who seek to develop and implement a technically sound aquatic habitat restoration program. The focus of the partnership is to protect, restore and maintain stream, estuary and coastal marine habitats to benefit native aquatic life and fishery resources in the State of Hawaii.

The main Hawaiian Islands have 1,207 kilometers (km) of shoreline and approximately 2,526 km² of coral reef. Approximately 612 species of fish have been observed in nearshore coastal marine habitats of the islands. The geographic isolation of Hawaii has resulted in some of the highest endemism of any tropical marine ecosystem on earth. Approximately 370 perennial streams are located on the five largest Hawaiian Islands, of these about 40 form stream-mouth estuaries at their confluence with the sea. These streams and estuaries support communities of fish and invertebrates that are diadromous and must complete migration to and from freshwater to the sea and back during the course of their life cycle.

By several measures, nearshore marine and coral reef habitats of Hawaii have degraded in recent decades. This is illustrated by decreasing estimates of live coral cover and by a marked loss of standing stock fish biomass, particularly in areas adjacent to large human populations. Similarly, inland waters including streams, estuaries and anchialine pools exhibit diminished habitat availability and reduced biological function throughout the Hawaiian Islands. Widespread impacts include physical alteration of stream channels, degradation of water quality, extensive water withdrawals, and the introduction of detrimental non-native species. An important management goal for stream systems in Hawaii is removal of migration barriers to allow passage of native fish and invertebrates between the sea and interior watersheds.

This Strategic Plan is the result of a collaborative, consensus-based and scientifically-driven process whereby stream, estuarine and coastal marine conservation actions undertaken by the partnership were identified and prioritized. The partnership has four broad goals:

- I. Maintain, protect, manage, and restore aquatic habitat in sufficient quantity and quality to allow native species to thrive;
- II. Address priority invasive species with prevention, early detection, rapid response, and ongoing control or eradication;
- III. Manage, and disseminate scientific and technical information needed to improve the effectiveness of conservation and recovery programs; and
- IV. Improve partnerships and cooperative efforts and strengthen outreach and education leading to improved understanding of native aquatic wildlife resources in Hawaii.

The partnership is composed of representatives from State and Federal resource agencies, regional watershed coalitions, the Hanalei Watershed Hui, the Nature Conservancy, private

landowners and industry representatives such as Maui Land and Pineapple Inc., Kamehameha Schools and the Hawaii Farm Bureau.

Through ongoing commitment to effectively organize and communicate across organizational boundaries, the partnership will focus existing and future resources on aquatic habitat restoration, partnership and outreach to achieve the priorities identified in this strategic plan

I. INTRODUCTION

The Hawaiian Island chain is one of the most geographically isolated island groups in the world. The islands consists of two regions: the Main Hawaiian islands (MHI) which are composed of high volcanic islands and which have localized barrier or fringing coral reefs abutting their shores; and the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI) which consist of widely scattered uninhabited coral atolls, islands and banks that extend over 2,000 kilometers (km) northwest of the MHI. The main islands (Kauai, Niihau, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, Lanai, Kahoolawe, and Hawaii Island) together have 1,207 km of shoreline and approximately 2,526 km² of coral reef.

The archipelago is located in the middle of the Pacific Ocean and as a result Hawaii's coral reefs are exposed to large open ocean swells and strong tradewinds. These dynamic natural processes largely define the topographic structure of Hawaiian coastal marine environment. The geographic isolation of Hawaii has resulted in some of the highest rates of endemism of any tropical marine ecosystem on earth. Some of these endemic species are dominant components of the coral reef community, resulting in unique marine ecosystems that have high conservation value on a global scale.

Freshwater ecosystems in the islands were similarly influenced by geographic isolation and were shaped by rainfall patterns associated with tradewinds. Approximately 370 streams are located across the main Hawaiian Islands, of these, about 40 of the larger stream systems form stream-mouth estuaries at their confluence with the sea. Perennial streams are primarily located on island coastlines that are exposed to the northeast tradewinds. Leeward areas are much more arid and perennial streams are less common in leeward areas, particularly on the southwestern flanks of the larger islands of Maui and the Big Island. Like the marine environment, the inland waters of Hawaii similarly exhibit numerous endemic species. The entire native freshwater vertebrate fauna, as well as the larger invertebrates of Hawaiian streams, includes only five species of fish, two species of mollusk, and two species of crustacean (prawn and shrimp). The ancestors of the Hawaiian stream fish were evolutionarily derived from stream species with marine larvae capable of transport and dispersal over long distance from the Indo-Pacific north and east to Hawaii. The biogeographic origins of the Hawaiian stream mollusks and crustaceans are poorly studied and not as well known.

Island environments by their very nature are subject to resource limitations. Geographic distance, coupled with ever-growing human resource needs that alter coastal marine landscapes and increasing human uses of water resources have severely altered marine and freshwater ecosystems in Hawaii. The missions of several State and Federal agencies as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community groups specifically identify conservation and restoration of marine and freshwater resources in Hawaii. A number of conservation and fishery management programs have been implemented to increase conservation in coral reef habitats, for example the *Hawaii Coral Reef Strategy* developed by the State of Hawaii in cooperation with the US Coral Reef Task Force. However, it is widely recognized that to date, few on-the-ground programs have been implemented to conserve and restore inland aquatic systems. Hawaii lags behind the rest of the nation in implementation of actions to address the decline of inland water habitats that support fishery resources and unique aquatic communities.

This record of accomplishment can be improved with better coordination, more resources, and better communication among parties in the state that are tasked with aquatic resource conservation mandates. A major challenge is that Hawaii is fragmented geographically and resource managers face logistical challenges and high expenses due to the need to work on multiple islands. An important need to improve aquatic resource management is to foster communication, develop expertise, and to direct resources for application at locations where on-the-ground action is most needed.

The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership (HFHP) was formed to fill these un-met needs in aquatic resource conservation. The partnership was conceived to form a cooperating workgroup for coordinated planning, development, funding and implementation of on-the-ground habitat restoration projects that address degradation of streams and stream-mouth estuaries in the islands and to provide leadership for integrating restoration planning on a watershed or “ridge-to-reef” basis. The partnership functions and provides guidance across traditional boundaries of agency, NGO, communities and the private sector to accelerate development of on-the-ground projects that will result in demonstrable success in aquatic resource recovery. The HFHP continues to grow with input and support from public and private stakeholders (Appendix II).

Participating HFHP organizations include several State agencies that have authority to manage water resources and the habitats and species that are found in State waters. These include the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR), the Commission on Water Resource Management (CWRM), and the Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) Environmental Planning Office and Environmental Management Division Clean Water Branch. Other State-level participants include the DLNR Division of Forestry and Wildlife (DOFAW) and Division of State Parks, both of which own and manage thousands of acres of conservation lands where significant aquatic resources are found. Federal agency participation includes the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service Pacific Islands Area Office; the USDA Forest Service Southwest Experiment Station Institute of Pacific Islands Forestry; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Pacific Islands Regional Office, Office of Habitat Conservation; the NOAA National Ocean Service Pacific Services Center; the U.S. Geological Survey Hawaii Water Science Center; the US Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office (PIFWO); and others.

In addition to government agencies, several non-governmental and private organizations are participating in the HFHP, these include several watershed coalitions that have formed to provide stewardship support on public and private lands such as the Hanalei Watershed Hui, the Hui o Koolaupoko, the Kohala Watershed Partnership, East Maui Watershed Partnership and others. Private landowner support has come from Kamehameha Schools, and Maui Land and Pineapple, Inc. Industry involvement has come from the Hawaii Farm Bureau, a non-profit organization of farmers, landowners and agriculture-affiliated businesses united for the purpose of formulating action to support agriculture in Hawaii.

Partnership History

The HFHP was formed under the umbrella of the National Fish Habitat Action Plan (NFHAP), which is a nationwide strategy that seeks to minimize and reverse the causes of aquatic resource decline. The plan calls for the formation of place-based or resource based fish habitat partnerships to function as the “primary work units” of NFHAP. The HFHP fits well within this organizational structure and can contribute to the national goals of NFHAP. The action plan is structured across agency, NGO and private-sector boundaries and calls upon local expertise to identify and coordinate local and regional efforts to build partnerships that independently develop and implement habitat restoration projects. A primary goal of NFHAP is to create synergy that builds upon multi-partner cooperative conservation that will achieve results not possible by these organizations working alone.

Interest in formation of a partnership prompted PIFWO and DAR to co-host an exploratory “kick-off” meeting in September 2007 to gauge support by stakeholders. A diverse group of partners including DAR, DOH, CWRM, DOFAW, EPA and the U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii Environmental Command attended the meeting and committed to forming a partnership at that time.

A major step in the formation of the HFHP was the February 2008 Strategic Planning workshop convened in Honolulu and co-hosted by DAR and PIFWO. This meeting was attended by over 30 individuals representing a cross-section of State and Federal agency, NGO, Native Hawaiian groups, private landowners and regional- and headquarters-level participation by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). The purpose of the facilitated meeting was to develop an outline of realistic goals, objectives, work products and timelines to form a HFHP Draft Strategic Plan. The workshop expanded upon on existing State-identified conservation goals set forth in the Hawaii’s Statewide Aquatic Wildlife Conservation Strategy (SAWCS 2005). The conservation goals of the SAWCS served as the starting point in the process of developing and prioritizing objectives to achieve restoration of inland waters in Hawaii. At the workshop, the conservation goals outlined in the SAWCS were made more specific with input from stakeholders. Participants reviewed aquatic habitat conservation needs to specifically address stream and stream-mouth estuary aquatic resource issues.

The National Fish Habitat Board invited candidate partnerships to apply for recognition under NFHAP during an application period that closed December 19, 2008. The application requirements included a description of the organizational structure and capacity of the HFHP, and submittal of a draft strategic plan. After consideration by the Board, the HFHP was granted full recognition as a fish habitat partnership under NFHAP on March 5, 2009. This recognition carried with it: 1) the recommendation by the board that the HFHP expand its habitats of interest to include coastal marine areas, including coral reef habitats; and 2) that the HFHP finalize its strategic plan.

Technical Support for Strategic Planning

An important source of technical support for prioritizing aquatic habitat restoration efforts in Hawaii is the *“Atlas of Hawaiian Watersheds and their Aquatic Resources”*. The Atlas was

developed by the DAR and is available to the public on CD and on the internet (<http://www.hawaiiwatershedatlas.com>). The Atlas compiles biological information, habitat data and land use information from virtually every watershed in the state. Geographic information in the database links the biological data to topographic features, land ownership and land use on a watershed-by-watershed basis. Another important source of information that was used to understand conservation needs and opportunities for coastal marine areas was the *Marine Ecoregional Assessment for the Main Hawaiian Islands* (The Nature Conservancy Hawaii Marine Program, 2009). This assessment identified 65 discreet coastal areas of biological importance for long-term resiliency of coral reefs based on a range of technical data, geospatial analyses and expert review. Subsets of these coastal marine sites were chosen as priority coral reef conservation areas by the Hawaii Coral Program. Preliminary results of the Hawaii portion of the *National Assessment of Fish Habitat* were also used. This geospatial analysis was undertaken to integrate inland and coastal marine conservation focus areas for planning purposes.

II. VISION AND MISSION OF THE HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP

The *vision* of the HFHP is a long-term goal that defines our contribution to a desired future condition of aquatic resources in Hawaiian streams, estuaries and coastal marine environments. This vision states an endpoint that the partnership intends to reach as a result of strategic plan implementation. The vision statement serves as a springboard for action and challenge for partners:

The vision of the Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership is;

- **The environmental resource value, cultural resource value, and sustainable use of Hawaiian stream, estuary, and nearshore marine resources are improved and/or maintained;**
- **Populations of native freshwater, estuarine and nearshore marine species are protected and restored;**
- **To maintain and/or expand freshwater, estuarine, and nearshore marine habitats that fully support native aquatic life, and;**
- **The natural value and environmental function of freshwater, estuarine and nearshore marine habitats increasingly benefit the people of Hawaii and the nation.**

The *mission statement* of the HFHP is a short, formal statement of the purpose of the partnership as an active, functional organization. The mission statement guides the actions of the HFHP and spells out the overall goal of the partnership. The mission statement provides a sense of direction for decision-making and provides the framework and context within which the HFHP strategic actions are formulated.

The mission of the Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership is:

The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership seeks to cooperatively develop and implement conservation projects to benefit native aquatic life and sustainable uses of streams, estuaries, and nearshore marine habitats through the support and participation of government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and communities.

III. COASTAL MARINE, STREAM, AND ESTUARY RESOURCES OF HAWAII

Physical Features of the Islands

The Hawaiian archipelago consists of eight main islands and the numerous shoals and atolls of the northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Erosion of the original volcanic massifs that formed the main islands resulted in steep-walled valleys with well-developed soils and numerous stream systems across the state. In the southwest of the island chain, Hawaii Island is geologically the youngest of the main islands and is characterized by gently sloping shield volcanoes and frequent, long lasting eruptions. Volcanoes on the other islands are dormant or extinct. Kaua`i is geologically the oldest of the main islands. Islands with extensive windward exposure include Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, Oahu and Kaua`i. The windward-exposed areas are characterized by deep valleys, high rainfall, abundant vegetation, and numerous streams and springs.

Coastal Marine Ecosystems

Shallow water benthic habitats in the Hawaiian Islands are dominated by a variety of substrate types including mud, sand, basaltic boulder, coral rubble, and broad expanses of limestone pavement (Battista et al 2007). Biological benthic cover is highly variable and can consist of seagrass, macroalgae, algal turf, coralline algae and coral. Although not all nearshore marine bottom areas are structurally formed from coral material, the majority of open coastline and protected shoreline benthic habitats are coral-dominated. These coral-dominated habitats (referred to generally as coral “reefs”) are of particular interest for conservation planning due to high rates of endemism, overall biodiversity, and importance for fishery resources. Coral reef habitats are sensitive to human-caused degradation and are increasingly recognized to be at risk as a result of global climate change.

Coral reefs of the Hawaiian Islands are geologically young and not as well developed as reefs in areas with a longer geologic history. Most coral reefs in the MHI consist of small fringing reefs that occur close to shore. There is a westward trend towards greater reef development which coincides with the geologic ages of the islands. Superimposed upon this pattern, however, are the effects of wave exposure: in general, the more sheltered leeward coasts, and leeward embayments in particular, have reefs with greater coral cover than wave-exposed windward shorelines.

Due to the geographic isolation of the Hawaiian Islands, Hawaiian reef communities are less diverse than many other coral reefs areas, especially those in the broader Indo-Pacific province extending to the west and south of the islands. One consequence of lower overall diversity is

that reef-building corals in Hawaii are more generalized in their microhabitat requirements and distribution than other coral species. As a result, relatively few coral species dominate Hawaiian reefs, despite the unusually high level of endemism among marine organisms (Table 1). In response to variation in environmental conditions near the shoreline, coral reefs exhibit zonation where the abundance and composition of the coral community varies according to depth and distance from shore. Wave exposure is the primary factor causing coral community zonation in Hawaii but gradients in sedimentation, salinity, and temperature are also important. Hawaiian reefs do not exhibit a high abundance of filter feeding animals such as soft corals, sponges, tunicates, and bivalves. As a result, Hawaiian reefs are more clearly dominated by corals.

Table 1. Endemism in coastal marine fauna of Hawaii

Taxon	Percent endemic
Algae	18%
Sponges	48%
Hard corals	18%
Soft corals	49%
Gastropods	26%
Bivalves	51%
Crustaceans	38%
Fishes	23%

*From Kay and Palumbi 1987, Abbott 1999 & 2002 and Randall 2007

Threats to coastal marine habitats

Coral reefs played an important role in ancient Hawaiian culture and subsistence. Like many Polynesian societies, pre-contact Hawaiians had intimate knowledge of ocean resources and employed a complex system to manage resources in ways that ensured long-term use. Some of these methods included the “kapu” system in which certain reef tracts or species would be declared off limits to regulate fishing at times that were thought to correspond to spawning and recruitment periods. Over time, these practices have disappeared due to cultural, political and demographic changes that have affected land ownership, land use, and water rights. Increasing consumptive resource use and non-point source pollution due to large human populations in coastal areas have greatly disrupted coastal marine ecosystem functions. Hawaii’s reefs are still in fair to good condition relative to other parts of the world, however, many near-shore reef tracts, especially those adjacent to urban areas and popular destinations, are in poor condition due to land-based sources of pollution, fishing pressure, recreational overuse and invasive species. Coral reefs have high resource value and provide valuable ecosystem services such as storm surge abatement, protection from ocean swell energy, and providing food for sustenance and commerce. In addition, Hawaii’s coral reefs generate approximately \$800 million annually to the state’s economy from marine tourism.

The onset of global climate change may bring about marked change in subtropical and tropical coastal marine ecosystems. Coral reefs provide both a biological and geological foundation to these coastal systems, and effects of sea-level rise, ocean acidification, and increased sea surface temperature may result in changes to biological communities as well as the structure and

function of the shoreline substrates that they inhabit. In response to ongoing degradation of coral reefs around the world, and in anticipation of increasing coral reef impacts due to global climate change, a petition was recently filed to list 82 species of coral as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). This administrative action is currently in the status review phase of the petition process. Nine of the coral species petitioned for listing are found in Hawaiian waters (Table 2).

Table 2. Coral species endemic to Hawaii included in petition for listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.*

Species	Occurrence	Habitat preference	Growth form
<i>Acropora paniculata</i>	Uncommon	Shallow lagoon, upper reef slope	Tabular
<i>Cyphastrea agassizi</i>	Uncommon	Shallow reef,	Encrusting to submassive
<i>Cyphastrea ocellina</i>	Uncommon	Upper reef slope	Massive to encrusting
<i>Leptoseris incrustans</i>	Uncommon	Shallow reef	Encrusting - plates
<i>Leptoseris yabei</i>	Uncommon	Flat substrate	Encrusting - plates
<i>Montipora dilatata</i>	Common	Subtidal	Encrusting - submassive
<i>Montipora flabellata</i>	Common	Shallow reef	Encrusting - nodular
<i>Montipora patula</i>	Abundant	Shallow reef	Encrusting - plates
<i>Porites pukoensis</i>	Rare	Shallow protected reef, lagoon	Massive, columnar
<i>Psammocora stellata</i>	Uncommon	Shallow wave washed rock	Submassive - branching

*Federal Register Notice 75 FR 6616, February 10, 2010.

Streams and Stream-Mouth Estuaries

The volcanic basalt that forms the bulk of the main Hawaiian Islands is porous and permeable, which facilitates infiltration and storage of groundwater. A large body of groundwater exists within these porous basalts throughout each of the larger islands. In addition to this basal groundwater layer, smaller, perched groundwater systems form at higher elevations, contained by dense geologic features of low permeability. The geomorphic characteristics of Hawaii’s streams such as channel form and function, as well as numerous physical and biological characteristics, are formed and maintained through the action of relatively frequent high flow events. However, low-flow and base-flow characteristics are equally important, especially in the maintenance and distribution of aquatic life during periods of drought. Because ground water reserves are extensive in some locations in the islands, streams, springs and rock seeps fed by basal ground water exhibit highly permanent, stable low flows. As a result, the aquatic communities may persist in streams despite occasional severe drought.

The aquatic macrofauna native to Hawaiian streams includes five species of diadromous fish and three diadromous aquatic invertebrates (Table 2). These organisms require cold, clean, high-quality stream water that is free of excessive land-derived nutrients and suspended particulates. All of these species require passage between the stream environment and the sea at two significant and vulnerable time periods in the course of their life histories. These migratory species are dependent upon a free-flowing connection to the sea, via the stream channel, to complete their development and reproduction. This diadromous life cycle is known as *amphidromy*; a two part life cycle whereby a migration from freshwater to the sea and back is completed during growth and development, but not for specifically for reproduction.

The two-part life cycle of amphidromous species begins as adults live and reproduce in stream habitats, newly hatched larvae are dispersed downstream to the ocean where the larvae live until they metamorphose from the larval stage to a postlarval body form and begin upstream migration. Three of the Hawaiian stream gobies have pelvic fins that are fused into a ventral suction disk which becomes functional upon metamorphosis. This unusual morphological adaptation is used to cling to rock surfaces. Two fish species, *Lentipes concolor* and *Sicyopterus stimpsoni*, are strong climbers and are capable of ascending vertical or overhanging waterfalls. The decapod shrimp *Atya bisulcata* and the neritid snail *Neritina granosa* are very good climbers and easily ascend steep stream channels. In some stream systems, large populations of these invertebrate species can be found above vertical or overhanging waterfalls as high as 900 feet.

Table 2. Native migratory freshwater organisms of Hawaiian streams.

Organism	Scientific name	Hawaiian name	Biogeographic status
Freshwater fish (family Gobiidae)	<i>Awaous guamensis</i>	O'opu nakea	indigenous
	<i>Lentipes concolor</i>	O'opu alamo'o	endemic
	<i>Stenogobius hawaiiensis</i>	O'opu naniha	endemic
	<i>Sicyopterus stimpsoni</i>	O'opu nopili	endemic
Freshwater fish (family Eleotridae)	<i>Eleotris sandwicensis</i>	O'opu akupa	endemic
Freshwater shrimp Crustacean	<i>Atyoida bisulcata</i>	Opae kala'ole	endemic
Freshwater prawn Crustacean	<i>Macrobrachium grandimanus</i>	Opae 'oeha'a	endemic
Freshwater snail (Mollusk)	<i>Neritina granosa</i>	Hihiwai	endemic

The climbing fish and invertebrates occasionally are found in high-elevation perennial sections of intermittent or interrupted (diverted) streams, above reaches that do not contain perennial flow. Upstream migration to these intermittently isolated upper reaches is opportunistic and is accomplished by a few successful upstream migrants as flowing water conditions allow. All of these stream-dwelling species are rarely found as adults in man-made waterbodies such as ditches, flumes, reservoirs or other impoundments. If juveniles are entrained into these types of structures and survive to adulthood, they are effectively removed from the population because their reproductive output is lost without a connection to the sea for downstream dispersal of larvae.

In addition to the migratory stream-dwelling fish and invertebrates whose larval life stage takes place in the ocean, a number of less-conspicuous native macroinvertebrates are found in inland water systems in Hawaii. Many of these are endemic to the Hawaiian Islands and some are

limited in distribution to single islands or single subregions within an island. These include the widespread but rare freshwater sponge (*Heteromyenia baileyi*), a diverse genus of endemic moths that have an aquatic larval stage (*Hyposmocoma sp.*), and the torrent midges (*Telmatogeton sp.*). An aquatic snail with a distribution limited to a few locations on Kauai (Newcomb’s snail, *Erinna newcombi*) is listed as “threatened” under the ESA. Two species of stream-associated damselflies in the genus *Megalagrion* were recently listed as endangered, three additional species are proposed for listing as endangered, and one species remains a candidate for listing. Six anchialine pool shrimp have candidate status (Table 3).

There are relatively few inland reaches where freshwater is regularly influenced by seawater to form discreet estuaries. Of the approximately 370 perennial streams in Hawaii, about 40 form stream-mouth estuaries. Estuaries in Hawaii are locally important because they provide juvenile nursery habitat for fish that inhabit marine environments as adults. As many as 30 marine fish species occupy these stream-mouth estuaries opportunistically as juveniles before moving to nearshore marine and coral reef habitat. Many of the fish species that use estuarine habitat when young are recreationally or commercially important at larger sizes. Examples include jacks (Carangidae), mullet (Mugilidae), flagtails (Kuhliidae) and others.

Threats to stream and estuary habitats

Human-caused modifications to surface and ground water systems throughout Hawaii have profoundly altered natural hydrologic regimes. The original human inhabitants of the islands converted many acres of coastal and valley lowlands to production of taro, a Polynesian staple food crop that is farmed in flooded fields created by stream water diverted from natural channels. In the modern era, complex irrigation conveyance systems were built to support the cultivation of sugar cane. These diversions transfer very large volumes of water out of natural watercourses and into extensive networks of ditches, tunnels, flumes, reservoirs, and ultimately, to fields. Historically, stream water diversion structures were built to be highly efficient in their ability to entrain water. Many of these structures divert all flowing stream water at moderate to low flows, leaving the stream channel below the dam completely dry. In some areas, ground water was exploited on an equally large scale to support agriculture and localized ground water draw-downs have reduced groundwater-supported base flows in many streams. A shift from large plantation agricultural uses of water to small-scale “diversified agriculture” and urban uses has occurred within the last several decades, with the decline of large-scale production of sugarcane.

Other human-caused alternations to streams and estuaries are equally widespread across Hawaii and have further limited habitat available to support native aquatic life. These impacts include flood control infrastructure such as cement channels, and levees that confine stream flows and disconnect streams from adjacent flood plains, sediment and debris basins, and erosion control modifications to coastal and estuarine shorelines. Although these features alone do not reduce water volume, many result in a departure from normal hydrographic characteristics by causing increased peak flows, prolonged dry periods, and altered physical and chemical characteristics, such as increased water temperatures.

Base-flow volumes of streams in the Hawaiian Islands have declined over recent decades (Oki 2009). The effects of global climate change are likely to continue, if not accelerate, this long-term trend. The continuous contribution of moisture carried to the islands by the tradewinds is

expected to decline, while intermittent storm-driven inputs of rain are expected to increase. A change to the overall water budget of the Hawaiian Islands is very likely, and the resulting change to aquatic habitats will likely include lower base flows, accelerated erosion, increased transport of sediment to receiving waters, and changes to wetland and riparian areas. Model predictions for the severity of these changes at the regional and subregional levels are not fully developed.

Anchialine Pools

Anchialine pools represent an inland waterbody type that is widespread but threatened throughout the Hawaiian Islands. The term “anchialine” is derived from Greek meaning “near the sea.” Anchialine pools are defined as land-locked bodies of water that occur near the coast in permeable substrates and which, by the presence of salt water and tidal fluctuations, show subsurface hydrologic connections both to the sea as well as the underlying fresh water table. They are characteristically brackish or saline but do not have surface connections to the open ocean. Anchialine pools are often formed in depressional areas found in geologically recent lava flows along coastlines, but occasionally they are situated in flooded solution cavities in coastal karsts (geologic formations composed of uplifted reef and limestone). In Hawaii, the majority of remaining anchialine pools are located on the Kona coast and southern coastlines of the Big Island, the southeast coast of Maui, and on several small and widely separated coastal sites on Oahu.

Anchialine pool salinities can range from near-fresh to concentrations just below that of sea water, although there are a few pools with high evaporation rates that exhibit salinities considerably higher than seawater (up to 41 ppt). Anchialine pools contain a fauna that is estuarine-like because they are tolerant of brackish water conditions. Currently there are six endemic anchialine pool shrimp that are candidates for listing under the ESA (Table 3). Several of these shrimp species are extremely rare and their basic biological characteristics, including life history patterns, current and historical ranges, and conservation needs are not known. The introduction of non-native predators (Poeciliids, “tilapia” and other fish) into anchialine pools is a severe problem that has eliminated the native fauna from many anchialine pools.

Threats to anchialine pool habitats

In the islands, disturbances due to agricultural and urban land use is most concentrated along shorelines, because of this anchialine pools have been severely impacted by coastal development. Many anchialine pools were filled in the past, and remaining pools continue to be affected by ongoing land use development, particularly resort and golf course construction along the Kona coast of the Big Island. Withdrawal of groundwater for domestic or irrigation use, and contamination of groundwater by polluted runoff originating from expanding urban areas present an ongoing threat. Because anchialine pools are located in shoreline areas, climate change effects such as sea level rise, decreased rainfall, and saltwater intrusion into coastal water tables may further decrease the extent of these aquatic habitats.

Table 3. Listed, proposed and candidate freshwater and anchialine pool organisms of Hawaii.

Organism	Scientific Name	Common name	Distribution	Status
Freshwater snail (Mollusk)	<i>Errina newcombi</i>	Newcombs snail	Kauai (~12 sites)	Threatened
Damselflies (Odonata: Libellulidae)	<i>Megalagrion pacificum</i>	Pacific damselfly	Molokai, Maui, Big Island (7 sites total)	Endangered
	<i>Megalagrion nesiotes</i>	Flying earwig Hawaiian damsel	Maui (1 site)	
	<i>Megalagrion nigrohamatum nigrolineatum</i>	Black-line damselfly	Oahu (~11 sites)	Proposed for ESA listing
	<i>Megalagrion oceanum</i>	Oceanic damselfly	Oahu (7 sites)	
	<i>Megalagrion leptodemus</i>	Crimson Hawaiian damselfly	Oahu (4 sites)	
		<i>Megalagrion xanthomelas</i>	Orangeback damselfly	Oahu, Lanai, Molokai, Maui, Big Island (18 sites total)
Anchialine pool shrimp	<i>Metabetaeus lohena</i>	No common name (NCN)	Maui, Big Island, Oahu (several sites)	
	<i>Antecaridina lauensis</i>	NCN	Maui (two sites), Big Island (two sites)	
	<i>Calliasmata pholidota</i>	NCN	Maui (two sites), Big Island (two sites)	
	<i>Palaemonella burnsi</i>	NCN	Maui (three sites), Big Island (one site)	
	<i>Procaris hawaiiiana</i>	NCN	Maui (two sites), Big Island (one site)	
	<i>Vetericaris chaceorum</i>	NCN	Big Island (single pool)	

IV. INTEGRATING CONSERVATION PLANNING FOR AQUATIC HABITATS *MAUKA TO MAKAI*

An emerging theme in aquatic resource conservation in Hawaii is the need to integrate habitat restoration planning and project implementation from *mauka* (inland) to *makai* (seaward) areas. Because island land masses are small, there are often very short distances between land-based sources of disturbance and coastal marine environments. Degradation of aquatic habitat caused by historical and current human land use practices extend into coastal waters, either via direct impacts (dredging, fill, or construction of seawalls) or indirectly through surface runoff and groundwater flow. Land-based sources of pollution, such as suspended sediment, nutrients and other pollutants represent one of several factors threatening the quality of nearshore marine ecosystems in Hawaii. Reef building corals are particularly sensitive to these impacts. The

complex interrelationship of direct and indirect land-based impacts to coral reefs, water quality degradation, aquatic invasive species, and overfishing on the health and integrity of coastal marine and coral reef ecosystems is not always well understood, however, enough is known to plan and implement conservation actions that minimize land-based impacts to marine systems.

Conservation projects intended to address land-based degradation of coastal marine and coral reef areas have direct impacts on inland aquatic habitats such as streams and estuaries which have conservation needs of their own. For example, diadromous fish passage in a stream may be impeded by a poorly-placed structure that is causing bank failure and the resulting eroded sediment is transported downstream to coastal marine habitats where it smothers live coral. Using an integrated approach, a project designed to improve coral reef habitat by reducing sediment transport could simultaneously enhance fish passage.

V. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP

The HFHP Steering Committee and various participants from the larger partners group met on three occasions to establish strategic goals and objectives appropriate for the partnership to pursue. Specific actions to achieve these strategic goals were also identified (Table 4). In recognition of anticipated constraints on time, technical capacity and limited funding, the Steering Committee was tasked with identifying the highest priority objectives among all objectives identified to achieve the goals of the partnership. A total of six objectives were selected as the high priority medium-term (5-10 year) objectives to guide and focus HFHP activities (Table 4, shaded text). These goals and objectives are especially important for guidance in selecting on-the-ground projects that the HFHP will directly support, and for identifying operational needs required to ensure that the partnership continues to function as a effective organization.

VI. STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Climate Change and Adaptive Management

Climate change will profoundly affect Hawaii's terrestrial and aquatic environments and the human communities that depend on these natural systems. Key vulnerabilities facing the Hawaiian Islands due to climate change include changes in the availability of freshwater, changes to coastal topography including sea level inundation, and impacts to coastal and marine ecosystems. The magnitude and temporal progress of climate change will always have an element of uncertainty. The most important planning elements required to prepare for climate change are resilience and adaptation. Through the implementation of this strategic plan, the HFHP will seek to enhance the ability for aquatic ecosystems to respond to the effects of climate change with increased resiliency. Development of HFHP habitat restoration projects and environmental management actions will consider appropriate spatial and temporal scales and adopt a decision-making framework that accounts for uncertainty in forecasting global climate change.

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP – STRATEGIC PLAN

Table 4. Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership strategic goals, objectives and actions. Priority objectives are shaded.

Goal	Objective	Action
<p><u>Goal I. Native species and habitats</u></p> <p><i>Maintain, protect, manage, and restore native species and habitats in sufficient quantity and quality to allow native species to thrive.</i></p>	<p>Objective 1: Preserve and improve habitat and connectivity by reducing impacts of instream structures that are barriers to native species passage.</p>	<p>Work with partners to remove or modify instream structures that impede native species migratory passage. Fund or provide technical assistance to partners for removing/modify at least one barrier per year annually through 2015.</p>
	<p>Objective 2: Provide expertise to establish defined instream flow volumes in natural stream channels adequate to restore and maintain viable populations of native fish and invertebrates.</p>	<p>Fund or provide technical assistance to develop and distribute engineering guidelines for fish passage in Hawaii.</p>
	<p>Objective 3: Address chemical and physical water quality characteristics to reduce or eliminate impacts to native species:</p>	<p>Provide technical assistance to partners to increase the number of streams with natural flow regimes.</p>
	<p>Objective 4: Support effective management for rare native species and their habitats.</p>	<p>Document changes in populations of native fish and invertebrates above and below modified or discontinued diversions in flow-restored streams.</p>
		<p>Support projects that lead to an increase in the number of streams, estuaries and coastal water bodies meeting water quality standards, as indicated by a reduction in the number of waterbodies listed as impaired.</p>
		<p>Contribute to restoration actions that ensure fish are safe to eat, as indicated by a reduction in the number of DOH fish consumption advisories.</p>
		<p>By 2011 complete surveys of known, historic and suspected Newcomb’s snail populations, and evaluate snail predation risk posed by introduced species.</p>
	<p>Support completion of statewide anchialine pond management plan by DLNR,</p>	<p>Contribute to development of damselfly recovery planning and implementation.</p>
	<p>Compile <i>Lentipes</i> data from Oahu from published and unpublished data for Stream Atlas.</p>	<p>Contribute to development of damselfly recovery planning and implementation.</p>

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP – STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal	Objective	Action
		Initiate invasive riparian vegetation control at priority estuary sites.
		Identify and map species distributions, make Atlas of Hawaiian Watersheds available in searchable database format for access on internet by end of CY 2012.
	Objective 5: Preserve and improve riparian and wetland habitats that are linked to streams, estuaries, nearshore marine habitat.	Increase number of riparian, estuarine and wetland acres protected and managed.
		Increase extent of riparian, estuarine and wetland habitat that support native species.
		Initiate hau control at priority locations with partners by 2013.
		Initiate mangrove control along priority estuary shorelines with partners by 2014.
	Objective 6: Develop and implement conservation projects that link inland and nearshore marine ecosystems to protect, restore and maintain self-sustaining aquatic communities.	Coordinate with Hawaii Coral Program to implement aquatic habitat restoration project adjacent to priority coral reef conservation areas.
<p><u>Goal II. Aquatic invasive species</u></p> <p><i>Address priority invasive species through a three-tiered approach combining: 1) prevention and interdiction, 2) early detection and rapid response, 3) and ongoing control or eradication.</i></p>	Objective 1: Support effective methods, tools and policies to detect, prevent and interdict the introduction and establishment of aquatic invasive species.	Revise screening procedures at ports of entry to better include AIS, hold workshops on aquatic species Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) for port and airline staff.
	Objective 2: Support effective management methods and tools for control of priority invasive species in freshwater, estuarine, nearshore marine, and anchialine systems.	Implement one new control method in two priority watersheds: one urban site and one conservation site.
	Objective 3: Support effective education and outreach for preventing	Within three years write outreach plan for aquatic invasive interdiction and control for inland waters of Hawaii.

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP — STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal	Objective	Action
	detecting and managing aquatic invasive species.	<p>Within five years produce and air TV commercial addressing aquatic invasive, distribute written AIS material at Hawaii Fishing Fair.</p> <p>Convene Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HAACP) workshops with partners actively doing aquatic restoration actions.</p>
<p><u>Goal III. Science and data</u></p> <p><i>Develop and implement activities to collect, manage, and disseminate information needed to guide effectiveness of conservation, management, and recovery programs.</i></p>	<p>Objective 1: Support research and monitoring to obtain data needed to guide conservation, management and recovery programs in stream, estuarine and nearshore marine waters.</p>	<p>Provide engineering and design information for support of fish passage.</p> <p>Support operation of stream gauges and hydrological analysis for support of native species.</p> <p>Contribute to statewide inventory of reservoir introductions and aquatic invasions.</p> <p>Assist review of impaired waters determination and contribute to TMDL biological data collection and analysis, support implementation of stream bioassessment protocols using macroinvertebrates.</p> <p>Conduct habitat surveys and inventories for aquatic organisms and improve efforts to make surveys more systematic and comprehensive.</p> <p>Support aquatic habitat data collection and analysis in Watershed Partnership monitoring programs.</p>
	<p>Objective 2: Support development and implementation of a framework to link watershed and nearshore marine physical and biological data across multiple geospatial and temporal scales.</p>	<p>Fund Watershed Atlas distribution and continued development of Species Atlas.</p> <p>Fund Statewide Inventory of Barriers to Fish Passage with State partners.</p> <p>Work with NFHAP Science and Data Committee representatives to ensure National Assessment of Fish Habitat adequately represents aquatic habitats of Hawaii</p>
	<p>Objective 3: Improve cooperation among stakeholders through</p>	<p>Assist with a quality assessment/quality control report for Hawaii Stream Atlas and related products.</p>

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP – STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal	Objective	Action
	dissemination of research and data regarding aquatic populations and habitat condition.	Provide technical assistance for Hawaii Dept. of Health water quality reports.
	Objective 4: Support research and monitoring to obtain data needed to assess effects of global climate change on stream, estuarine and nearshore marine waters.	Work with the Pacific Islands Climate Change Cooperative to ensure that evaluation of regional effects of climate change consider aquatic habitats.
<p><u>Goal IV. Partnership and education</u></p> <p><i>To improve partnerships and cooperative efforts and to strengthen outreach and education leading to improved understanding of native aquatic wildlife resources in Hawaii.</i></p>	Objective 1: Establish partnerships with private landowners, government agencies, and community groups to facilitate sustainable resource use and implement identified conservation actions.	Develop web site highlighting HFHP and its vision/mission, highlight stream and estuary restoration-related projects. Incorporate HFHP web presence with to NFHAP and related web sites.
		Identify existing networks and locally-based watershed alliances and coastal conservation groups with existing projects.
		Develop and distribute a synopsis of federal, state and NGO grants and other funding support appropriate for aquatic habitat restoration activities by cooperators.
	Objective 2: Increase public understanding of aquatic wildlife and habitat by developing and implementing a strategic conservation education program that would include public awareness campaigns.	Identify existing networks and contacts for locally-based watershed alliances and and coastal conservation groups on-going projects.
		Convene a stream restoration symposium or workshop, Steering Committee will investigate sponsoring symposium during Hawaii Conservation Conference.
		Increase partnership involvement in innovative approaches to protection and restoration of aquatic habitat.
Objective 3: Improve conservation education of visitors and the tourism industry regarding natural history, environmental value, and appropriate	Support education of visitors regarding the natural history, environmental value, and appropriate cultural considerations of inland and coastal marine waters, especially waters of high conservation value.	

HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP – STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal	Objective	Action
	cultural considerations of inland and nearshore marine waters.	Develop educational module on the topic of aquatic resource conservation for the Kapiolani Community College <i>Ho'okipa Me Ke Aloha / Ka'ana I Na Loina Hawai'i</i> - Sharing Hawai'i's Heritage Visitor Industry Training Certificate.

To effectively plan and implement an aquatic conservation program in recognition of the unpredictable onset of climate change the HFHP will focus on landscape-scale approaches to conservation that integrate science and management. This will include placing particular emphasis on: 1) understanding ecological systems and function, 2) applying model-based projections, 3) species-habitat linkages, 4) risk assessment, and 5) adaptive management.

Organizational Responsibilities

The organizational structure of the HFHP will include a standing Steering Committee composed representative partners with participation based upon interest and availability (Appendix II). The primary role of the Steering Committee is to implement this plan (and associated prioritization of stream and estuary protection, restoration, and enhancement projects) and a secondary role will be to foster communication between partners and work with cooperators to support implementation of successful aquatic habitat restoration projects. The Steering Committee will meet no less that twice per year and take the lead role in soliciting projects, communicating timelines for proposal requests, coordinating multiple funding sources and ranking projects for funding consideration. Subcommittees will be formed to address specific issues that require ongoing attention; these include the Science and Data Subcommittee, which will assist interaction between partners with technical capacity and will assist with national reporting initiatives. The Communications Subcommittee will ensure that meaningful and scientifically accurate outreach material reaches appropriate audiences through media and other outlets. When input is required on native Hawaiian resource uses, a Subsistence and Cultural Advisors subcommittee will be formed ensure that resource users provide advice and consultation regarding HFHP actions that may affect these constituencies.

The goals and objectives outlined in this plan will serve as the basis for the conservation actions undertaken by the HFHP through 2020. The Strategic Plan will be updated, if needed, in coordination with the National Fish Habitat Board review of the HFHP in 2012.

References Cited

- Abbott, I. A. 1999. Marine red algae of the Hawaiian Islands. Bishop Museum Press. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Abbott, I. A. and J. M. Huisman. 2004. Marine green and brown algae of the Hawaiian Islands. Bishop Museum Press. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Battista, T.A., Costa, B.M., and S.M. Anderson, S.M. 2007. Shallow-water benthic habitats of the main eight Hawaiian Islands (DVD). NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 61, Biogeography Team. Silver Spring, MD.
- Kay, E.A. and S. R. Palumbi. 1987. Endemism and evolution in Hawaiian marine invertebrates. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*. 2:183–186
- Oki, D.S. 2004. Trends in streamflow characteristics in Hawaii, 1913-2003. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2004-3104. 4 p.
- Randall, J.E. 2007. Reef and shore fishes of the Hawaiian Islands. University of Hawaii Sea Grant College Program. 546pp.

Appendix I – Focus Watersheds

Several sources of information were used by the partnership Watershed Subcommittee to identify priority areas for on-the-ground restoration. The *Atlas of Hawaiian Watersheds and their Aquatic Species*, which is an analytical product developed with partial support from the partnership, was an important data source. The Atlas includes a statewide stream quality rating system that incorporates stream survey data and other biological information, watershed size, hydrologic features and land use characteristics. Preliminary results from the Hawaii Islands portion of the *National Assessment of Fish Habitat* were used to understand potential relative disturbance values of watersheds/subwatersheds on a standardized statewide basis. A draft version of the *Hawaii Statewide Fish Passage Barriers Inventory*, another database product developed with support from the partnership, was also used to understand the potential impacts of man-made barriers to upstream migration and downstream dispersal of native freshwater organisms. A growing component of partnership activity is addressing watershed-related impacts to coastal marine and coral reef areas across the freshwater/marine interface. Watersheds located adjacent to priority coral reef conservation areas identified by the Hawaii Coral Reef Working Group in *The Hawaii Coral Reef Strategy: Priorities for Management in the Main Hawaiian Islands* were given priority in selection of focus watersheds. These data sources will continue to be developed and new information will be incorporated to guide selection of geographically focused partnership-supported restoration projects.

Table A-1. Focus watersheds and coastal segments selected for HFHP fish passage and fish habitat restoration project planning and design.

Focus Watershed	Primary habitat restoration needs	Priority	Notes
East Maui Watersheds and Coastal Areas – Huelo to Nahiku	Fish passage (irrigation diversions, road crossings)	High	Partial instream flow restoration for some streams in this region
West Maui Watersheds and Coastal Areas – Wailuku to Honolua	Fish passage (irrigation diversions, flood control)	High	Partial instream flow restoration for some streams in this region
North Shore Kauai Watersheds and Coastal Areas – Hanalei to Limahuli	Fish passage (irrigation diversions, road crossings), riparian vegetation control	Mid	Impacts of area stream diversions on migratory animals not well known
Kahana Watershed and Bay, Oahu	Invasive riparian vegetation control	Mid	Invasive trees in lower watershed
Koolaupoko Watersheds – Kahaluu to Hakipuu, Oahu	Invasive riparian vegetation control, wetland, stream channel alteration	Low	Support integration of inland and coastal restoration efforts
Waikele/Kipapa Watershed, Oahu	Fish passage (road crossings), stream channel alteration, nonpoint source pollution, invasive species)	Low	Large stream system with multiple impacts

Appendix II – Partners List

Note: * indicates Steering Committee member

Private / Large landowner

- Kamehameha Schools, Land Assets Division, Water Resources Management *
- Maui Land and Pineapple, Inc., West Maui Conservation Team, Makai Stewardship Program *

Industry Group

- Hawaii Farm Bureau*

Watershed Groups

- Hanalei Watershed Hui / Hanalei American Heritage River Program*
- Hawaii Association of Watershed Partnerships*
- East Maui Watershed Partnership
- West Maui Watershed Partnership
- East Molokai Watershed Partnership
- Kohala Watershed Partnership
- Koolau Mountains Watershed Partnership
- Kauai Watershed Alliance
- Hui o Koolaupoko

NGO

- The Nature Conservancy, Hawaii
- The Oceanic Institute
- Hawaii Wetland Joint Venture
- Hawaii Conservation Alliance
- KEY Project

State of Hawaii

- Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources
 - Division of Aquatic Resources*
 - Division Forestry and Wildlife*
 - Commission of Water Resource Management*
 - Natural Area Reserve System
 - Division of State Parks
- Hawaii Department of Health
 - Environmental Planning Office, Stream Bioassessment Program*
 - Clean Water Branch
- Office of State Planning
 - Coastal Zone Management Program
- Office of Hawaiian Affairs

Local / County

- Honolulu Board of Water Supply

University Researchers

- Michigan State University, Department of Biology
- Hawaii Pacific University
- University of Hawaii, Manoa, Department of Zoology, Institute of Marine Biology
- University of Hawaii, Hilo, Cooperative Studies Unit
- North Carolina State University, Department of Biology
- Tulane University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

Federal

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office*
 - Pacific Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex
- U.S. Geological Survey
 - Water Resources Division, Hawaii Water Science Center
 - Biological Resources Discipline, Pacific Islands Ecosystems Research Center*
- U.S. Forest Service
 - Southwest Experiment Station, Institute of Pacific Islands Forestry*
- NOAA Fisheries Pacific Islands Regional Office
 - Habitat Conservation Division*
 - NOAA Restoration Center
- NOAA National Ocean Service
 - Pacific Island Service Center
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 - Pacific Islands Contact Office*
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
 - Natural Resources Conservation Service *
- U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii
 - National Park Service, Inventory and Monitoring Program

Appendix III – Organizational Structure



HAWAII FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE



Introduction:

The intent of this document is to establish a self-identified, self-organized, self-directed group of participating government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and private entities that carry out aquatic habitat restoration in the Hawaiian Islands. This partnership uses shared expertise and technical knowledge to plan, fund and implement environmental restoration projects to benefit native aquatic species.

Section 1.

Partners agree in principle that aquatic habitats and the aquatic species that these habitats support have intrinsic value and represent important environmental resources for residents of Hawaii, the nation, and the world.

Section 2.

Partners recognize that a variety of natural and human-caused changes have altered aquatic habitats in the Hawaiian Islands and the result of these changes may diminish environmental functions and intrinsic values.

Section 3.

Partners who participate in this working group will apply sound scientific and technical knowledge, environmental management, cultural sensitivity, and socio-economic principles to restore, enhance and maintain aquatic habitats and the biodiversity supported by these habitats.

Section 4.

By working together, members of this organization enhance the effectiveness of efforts to protect and maintain healthy aquatic ecosystems.

Article I: Name

This organization is called the Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership.

Article II: Membership

Membership in the HFHP is open to organizations with public trust responsibilities and stewardship missions that include the goal of restoring, enhancing and maintaining aquatic habitats and the biodiversity that these habitat support.

Article III: Structure

The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership is structured as follows:

The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership seeks to cooperatively develop and implement aquatic conservation projects in Hawaiian streams and estuaries through the support and participation of government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector.

- *Partners Group* – organizations are considered partners based on interest expressed in communication via electronic and regular mail, professional meetings, other outreach, and informal contact.
- *Steering Committee* – A subgroup of key partners representing a range of agency, non-governmental organization and private interest perspectives will be solicited from the larger partners group based on interest, availability and agency mission and capacity.
- *Science and Data Subcommittee* – This subgroup facilitates participating agencies that possess assessment, monitoring and analytical capacity will cooperatively contribute technical assistance to HFHP projects.
- *Communications Subcommittee* – This subgroup reviews written outreach material including fact sheets and newsletters, may respond on the part of the Partnership to media inquiries and seek out opportunities for outreach and collaboration with new and non-traditional partners.
- *Subsistence and Cultural Advisors Subcommittee* – A group of private individuals, non-governmental organizations, and agency partners will provide consultation and advice on subsistence and cultural use of aquatic resources.

Article IV: Activities

The primary role of the HFHP is to implement the partnership strategic plan, a secondary role is to provide technical assistance and foster communication among partners. The HFHP has no authority beyond those of its individual members' organizations.

Article V: Governance

The Steering Committee forms the decision-making body of the HFHP. The Steering Committee strives to achieve consensus-based decision-making. If required, an appropriately-trained facilitator may be selected to guide committee decision process.

Article VI: Coordination

Logistical and staff support is provided by participating members on an irregular and infrequently rotating basis, according to interest and organization capacity. There is no implied requirement to provide staff support to be considered a partner in good standing.

Article VII: Meetings

The Steering Committee will meet no less than twice per year. Subcommittees will meet on an as-needed basis.

Article VIII: Amendment

The Steering Committee may amend this Charter in order to better achieve the goals of the partnership through facilitated consensus-based agreement.

The Hawaii Fish Habitat Partnership seeks to cooperatively develop and implement aquatic conservation projects in Hawaiian streams and estuaries through the support and participation of government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector.

TAB 10

FWS Policy Initiatives regarding Fish Habitat Partnerships

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Fisheries Management Team¹ adopted the attached “Position Paper on Fish Habitat Partnerships” in June 2010. Previously FWS has not spoken with one voice on a variety of issues related to Fish Habitat Partnerships (FHPs). The Position Paper is the result of FWS’ extensive efforts to develop a unified position that will improve leadership, coordination, and operational support for FHPs.

The Position Paper has 6 recommendations, some of which FWS can implement internally. For example, FWS has already acted on Recommendation 5 by moving up the date for issuing annual project selection guidance.

FWS requests concurrence and cooperation of the National Fish Habitat Board on four items:

1. FWS proposes to establish agency policy on how it supports FHP operations, considering FWS policy on Joint Ventures as a possible model (Recommendation 1). **FWS requests Board engagement in developing and implementing this policy, to be developed in 2011 for application in 2012.**
2. FWS proposes that a one-time, independent review of all FHPs be conducted (Recommendation 3). The review should be designed to satisfy the Board’s requirement that all FHPs be re-evaluated periodically to confirm that they continue to meet the Board’s criteria. **FWS requests Board endorsement of the FHP review, and Board participation in designing the review, to be conducted in 2011.**
3. **FWS recommends that the Board prohibit individuals serving on or staffing the Board from serving on FHP governing bodies to prevent a potential conflict of interest** (Recommendation 4).
4. The FWS Fisheries Program will aggressively pursue integration of FHPs with the network of Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs) to integrate the science needs of FHPs with the activities of LCCs. **FWS requests Board engagement in pursuing this integration.**

¹ Assistant Regional Directors-Fisheries from each FWS Region, Assistant Director-Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, and Chief-Division of Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Conservation

Position Paper on Fish Habitat Partnerships

Adopted by the Fisheries Management Team, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
June 2, 2010

Problem statement: The National Fish Habitat Action Plan (NFHAP) sets an objective of establishing 12 or more Fish Habitat Partnerships (FHPs) targeting priority habitats by 2010, formed around geographic areas, keystone fish species, or system types. Since 2001, FHPs have developed through self-directed local or regional leadership without top-down planning or constraints. The result is a landscape of FHPs across the United States addressing a variety of fish habitat conservation priorities at different geographic scales with varied approaches. The number of FHPs increased rapidly from 5 in 2007 to 17 in 2010, calling into question how the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and its partners can provide adequate operational resources to the FHPs so that they can effectively foster strategic fish habitat conservation. As the primary source of funds for FHP operational needs and projects, the Service has a strong interest in and responsibility for FHP attributes (i.e., number, size, configuration, overlap with other FHPs, diversity of partners) that may affect their delivery of fish habitat conservation. However, the Service has not spoken with one voice on these issues, and the need for a unified position on FHPs has only become more urgent with the potential enactment of NFHAP legislation and the tight budgets likely for the next several years.

Purpose: Develop a unified Service position that will improve leadership, coordination, and operational support for Fish Habitat Partnerships, resulting in effective delivery of fish habitat conservation under the National Fish Habitat Action Plan.

Key to acronyms

NFHAP = National Fish Habitat Action Plan

NFHB = National Fish Habitat Board

NFHCA = National Fish Habitat Conservation Act (H.R. 2565 or S. 1214)

FHP = Fish Habitat Partnership

SHC = Strategic Habitat Conservation

LCC = Landscape Conservation Cooperative

The Service has several opportunities to interact on national, regional, and local levels:

- Routine Service representation at all NFHB meetings
- Special presentations or recommendations presented to the NFHB
- Required re-evaluation of FHPs every 5 years or less (none completed yet)
- Expected revision of NFHAP in 2011 (required if NFHCA is enacted)
- Policy guidance on use of Service NFHAP funds (existing policy at *717 FW 1* and policy to be developed for implementing NFHCA)

There is not one optimal configuration of FHPs. One size does not fit all, geographically or operationally. FHPs have developed in a self-directed manner, resulting in a landscape of FHPs addressing a variety of conservation priorities at different geographic scales with varied approaches. FHPs, like the Service Regions, need flexibility in how they approach problem-solving and implementation within their organizations and across partnerships. Size and geographic configuration affect the operational needs of an FHP, but an FHP's effectiveness in delivering fish habitat conservation is not directly dependent on its size and configuration.

Recommendation 1 - Develop a policy on how the Service supports FHP operations. The Service has a fiduciary responsibility to ensure that Service dollars are spent effectively for all NFHAP functions, including FHP operations. The Service is currently supporting the operations of FHPs in different ways across the Regions. NFHCA, if enacted, will require the Service to provide funding for the operational needs of FHPs. The Service should establish policy on how it supports FHP operations, considering the Service Manual chapter *721 FW 6 Joint Ventures* as a potential model. A policy should be developed whether or not NFHCA is enacted into law. *Responsible party / time frame: ARDs nominate a writing team to draft a policy to be completed by September 30, 2011 for application in FY 2012.*

Recommendation 2 - Provide permanent, stable support for FHP coordination¹ at partnership, (Service) Regional, and national levels, including Service staff that support FHP operations and provide on-the-ground biological support. Many agencies and partners are asking the Service to take a leadership role in developing and supporting operations of FHPs. Through 2010, funds allocated to Regions for "FHP development and operations" have been flex funds. In 2011, that category should be moved into the base for the Regions, similar to existing "Coordination and Leadership" funds that are allocated to the Regions and to the Washington Office, with the understanding that this decision will reduce flexibility in future allocation decisions. If an increase in Fisheries Program NFHAP funds is included in the FY 2012 President's budget, consider dedicating most or all of those funds to build Service capacity to support FHP operations. *Responsible party / time frame: AFHC to implement during 2011 budget allocation and 2012 budget formulation cycles.*

Recommendation 3 - Evaluate FHPs through an independent entity. The Service should coordinate with the NFHB to contract for a thorough one-time, independent review of Fish Habitat Partnerships, to encompass all recognized FHPs, and Candidate FHPs as appropriate. The results of a comprehensive review will aid the Service in meeting its fiduciary responsibility with respect to FHP operations and projects, and will help to identify gaps where current FHPs are not adequately addressing Service and NFHB priorities. The review would identify the current level of effectiveness of individual FHPs and what factors promote or hamper effective fish habitat conservation under

¹ Service budget justifications describe coordination as follows: FHP coordination includes operation of FHPs and development of Candidates, FHP meeting and travel expenses, outreach, strategic planning, and development of scientific capabilities. Regional coordination includes staff support for FHP operations, helping FHPs rank and select habitat projects, reporting accomplishments of habitat projects, providing biological expertise and technical assistance to FHPs, and outreach efforts in support of the Action Plan. National coordination includes budget development and execution; accountability; staff support for NFHB activities; leadership of the Federal Caucus; and national communication with partners, Service employees, Congress, and the Administration.

NFHAP, such as the diversity of partners involved and the geographic size of an FHP (i.e. economies of scale). The review should be designed to satisfy the NFHB's requirement that all FHPs be re-evaluated periodically to confirm that they continue to meet the NFHB's criteria. The cost of a contractor should be identified in allocating the Service's 2011 NFHAP budget. *Responsible party / time frame: ARDs nominate a team to develop scope of work. AFHC to request bids within 90 days of enactment of 2011 appropriations. Evaluation to be completed by September 30, 2011.*

Recommendation 4 – Clearly define appropriate roles of NFHB members, NFHB staff and Service employees with respect to service on FHP governing bodies.

Roles of the NFHB include establishing guidance for recognizing FHPs (both currently and under NFHCA, if enacted), and selecting projects for funding (under NFHCA). Therefore, individuals serving on or staffing the NFHB should be prohibited from serving on FHP governing bodies to prevent a potential conflict of interest. The Service should present this recommendation for enactment by the NFHB. The Service also should consider including this provision in Service policy to promote accountability for Service funds. While Service employees do not pose the same conflict of interest when serving on FHPs, they would benefit from Service policy that clarifies their roles on FHP governing bodies, consistent with Joint Ventures and Departmental guidance.

Responsible party / time frame: AFHC to prepare recommendation and present to NFHB in October 2010.


Recommendation 5 – Issue guidance for project selection consistent with the Service Manual (717 FW 1) in June each year so that the guidance is timely for the FHPs to use in their project ranking and selection.

(The FWS Manual states that guidance should be issued in October each year.) The purpose of the guidance is to assist FHPs in project ranking and selection to ensure Service dollars are spent according to Service and NFHAP policy and priorities. The guidance should 1) respect the priority-setting role of FHPs; 2) incorporate priorities of the NFHB; and 3) promote linkages to Service priorities, including SHC and LCCs. The 2011 guidance would be issued before funding decisions are made, so it would not include dollar figures for FHP projects for 2011. *Responsible party / time frame: AFHC (Tom Busiahn) to draft memo, consult with Regions on content, and seek to obtain the Director's signature by June 30.*

Recommendation 6 – Integrate FHPs and the LCC network. In their Service-funded projects, FHPs are expected to make use of the most current science and proven technology. FHPs should be encouraged to identify and integrate their science needs that relate to landscape-level conservation with the activities of LCCs, in order to effectively deliver aquatic habitat conservation for priority species. The Fisheries Program should aggressively pursue integration through Regional Director and Fisheries ARD participation in LCC meetings, and communicate across Regions and LCCs to share lessons learned and ensure aquatic habitats are adequately considered.

Responsible party / timeframe: Fisheries ARDs and staff; Ongoing.

TAB 11



Site Usage

9,378 Visits

58.22% Bounce Rate


21,574 Pageviews

00:02:39 Avg. Time on Site

2.30 Pages/Visit


67.73% % New Visits

Visitors Overview



Visitors
6,775

Map Overlay



Traffic Sources Overview





- **Search Engines**
6,188.00 (65.98%)
- **Referring Sites**
1,646.00 (17.55%)
- **Direct Traffic**
1,544.00 (16.46%)

Content Overview

Pages	Pageviews	% Pageviews
/	5,298	24.56%
/index.php?option=com_conten	1,282	5.94%
/index.php?option=com_conten	1,033	4.79%
/index.php?option=com_conten	932	4.32%
/index.php?option=com_conten	809	3.75%

Goals Overview





6,775 people visited this site

9,378 Visits

6,775 Absolute Unique Visitors

21,574 Pageviews

2.30 Average Pageviews


00:02:39 Time on Site

58.22% Bounce Rate

67.73% New Visits

Technical Profile

Browser	Visits	% visits	Connection Speed	Visits	% visits
Internet Explorer	5,893	62.84%	T1	3,212	34.25%
Firefox	2,184	23.29%	Unknown	2,364	25.21%
Safari	869	9.27%	Cable	2,107	22.47%
Chrome	348	3.71%	DSL	1,519	16.20%
Mozilla	22	0.23%	Dialup	138	1.47%



All traffic sources sent a total of 9,378 visits

16.46% Direct Traffic

17.55% Referring Sites


65.98% Search Engines



- Search Engines
6,188.00 (65.98%)
- Referring Sites
1,646.00 (17.55%)
- Direct Traffic
1,544.00 (16.46%)

Top Traffic Sources

Sources	Visits	% visits	Keywords	Visits	% visits
google (organic)	4,958	52.87%	agulowak lodge	1,250	20.20%
(direct) ((none))	1,544	16.46%	national fish habitat action plan	355	5.74%
bing (organic)	620	6.61%	nfhap	293	4.73%
yahoo (organic)	439	4.68%	agulowak lodge alaska	183	2.96%
fws.gov (referral)	340	3.63%	fish habitat	174	2.81%




Visitors completed 71 goal conversions

71 conversions, Goal 1: Register

Goal Performance

Goal Conversion Rate




Goal Conversion Rate
0.76%

Total Goal Value




Total Goal Value
\$0.00



9,378 visits came from 77 countries/territories


Site Usage						
Visits	Pages/Visit	Avg. Time on Site	% New Visits	Bounce Rate		
9,378 % of Site Total: 100.00%	2.30 Site Avg: 2.30 (0.00%)	00:02:39 Site Avg: 00:02:39 (0.00%)	67.64% Site Avg: 67.64% (0.00%)	58.22% Site Avg: 58.22% (0.00%)		
Country/Territory	Visits	Pages/Visit	Avg. Time on Site	% New Visits	Bounce Rate	
United States	8,831	2.34	00:02:43	66.15%	57.25%	
Canada	116	2.10	00:01:58	89.66%	66.38%	
India	53	1.19	00:00:50	98.11%	88.68%	
United Kingdom	45	1.24	00:00:43	97.78%	84.44%	
Philippines	44	1.11	00:00:32	90.91%	90.91%	
Australia	41	2.29	00:02:41	70.73%	58.54%	
South Africa	13	1.00	00:00:00	100.00%	100.00%	
China	11	1.27	00:00:46	90.91%	63.64%	
Germany	11	1.45	00:00:12	100.00%	72.73%	

Netherlands	10	1.70	00:00:30	100.00%	80.00%
					1 - 10 of 77



Pages on this site were viewed a total of 21,574 times


 21,574 Pageviews

 17,242 Unique Views

 58.41% Bounce Rate

Top Content

Pages	Pageviews	% Pageviews
/	5,298	24.56%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&catid=49:waters-	1,282	5.94%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=	1,033	4.79%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=	932	4.32%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=	809	3.75%



Site Usage

2,004 Visits

52.89% Bounce Rate


4,723 Pageviews

00:03:03 Avg. Time on Site

2.36 Pages/Visit


57.09% % New Visits

Visitors Overview




Visitors
1,355

Map Overlay



Traffic Sources Overview





- **Search Engines**
1,270.00 (63.40%)
- **Direct Traffic**
371.00 (18.52%)
- **Referring Sites**
362.00 (18.07%)

Content Overview

Pages	Pageviews	% Pageviews
/	1,336	28.29%
/index.php?option=com_conten	253	5.36%
/index.php?option=com_conten	233	4.93%
/index.php?option=com_conten	168	3.56%
/index.php?option=com_conten	159	3.37%

Goals Overview





1,354 people visited this site

2,003 Visits

1,354 Absolute Unique Visitors

4,722 Pageviews

2.36 Average Pageviews


00:03:03 Time on Site

52.92% Bounce Rate




57.06% New Visits

Technical Profile

Browser	Visits	% visits	Connection Speed	Visits	% visits
Internet Explorer	1,172	58.51%	T1	744	37.14%
Firefox	456	22.77%	Unknown	560	27.96%
Safari	282	14.08%	Cable	355	17.72%
Chrome	81	4.04%	DSL	313	15.63%
Mozilla Compatible Agent	4	0.20%	Dialup	25	1.25%



All traffic sources sent a total of 2,003 visits

-  18.51% Direct Traffic
-  18.06% Referring Sites
-  63.42% Search Engines




- Search Engines
1,270.00 (63.40%)
- Direct Traffic
371.00 (18.52%)
- Referring Sites
362.00 (18.07%)

Top Traffic Sources

Sources	Visits	% visits
google (organic)	1,111	55.44%
(direct) ((none))	371	18.51%
bing (organic)	77	3.84%
yahoo (organic)	64	3.19%
fws.gov (referral)	61	3.04%

Keywords	Visits	% visits
national fish habitat action plan	102	8.03%
third annual-mat-su-salmon-	91	7.16%
nfhap	68	5.35%
fish habitat	61	4.80%
desert fish habitat partnership	42	3.30%




Visitors completed 21 goal conversions

21 conversions, Goal 1: Register


Goal Performance

Goal Conversion Rate




Goal Conversion Rate
1.05%

Total Goal Value



Total Goal Value
\$0.00




2,004 visits came from 48 countries/territories


Site Usage

Country/Territory	Visits	Pages/Visit	Avg. Time on Site	% New Visits	Bounce Rate
United States	1,854	2.43	00:03:06	54.26%	51.40%
Canada	24	1.46	00:00:27	83.33%	62.50%
Philippines	15	1.07	00:00:01	93.33%	93.33%
United Kingdom	12	1.08	00:00:01	91.67%	91.67%
India	12	1.42	00:01:28	100.00%	83.33%
Australia	8	1.50	00:00:21	100.00%	50.00%
France	6	1.50	00:34:35	66.67%	50.00%
South Korea	5	1.60	00:00:45	40.00%	0.00%
Thailand	4	1.50	00:00:28	100.00%	50.00%


China	4	1.25	00:00:31	75.00%	50.00%
					1 - 10 of 48



Pages on this site were viewed a total of 4,723 times

 **4,723** Pageviews

 **3,796** Unique Views

 **53.19%** Bounce Rate

Top Content

Pages	Pageviews	% Pageviews
/	1,336	28.29%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=	253	5.36%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=	233	4.93%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=	168	3.56%
/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=	159	3.37%

Facebook Facts:

- More than 500 million active users
- 50% of our active users log on to Facebook in any given day
- Average user has 130 friends
- People spend over 700 billion minutes per month on Facebook

User activity:

- There are over 900 million objects that people interact with (pages, groups, events and community pages)
- Average user is connected to 80 community pages, groups and events
- Average user creates 90 pieces of content each month
- More than 30 billion pieces of content (web links, news stories, blog posts, notes, photo albums, etc.) shared each month.

LinkedIn Facts:

- 75 million LinkedIn members across the globe
- Access to companies (Similar to Facebook)
- Professional Job and Company seeking service

South Fork, Little Conemaugh River, Pennsylvania

2009 10 "Waters to Watch"



NATIONAL
FISH HABITAT
ACTION PLAN

www.fishhabitat.org



A Conservation Snapshot: South Fork, Little Conemaugh River

The South Fork of the Little Conemaugh River in Cambria County, which runs through the towns Beaverdale and Lloydell is a renowned Pennsylvania Stream that has the potential to rebound following years of point source pollution, and become a quality Eastern Brook Trout headwater fishery.

The quality of the South Fork of the Little Conemaugh River has been in decline due historic acid mine drainage (AMD) in the watershed, dating back to the 1960's. AMD along with acid deposition have depressed the brook trout and aquatic life in this four mile stretch of river due to low PH, high aluminum, and low alkalinity. In addition, the stream bank shows major erosion along one 300-foot stretch.

A Federal grant through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the National Fish Habitat Action Plan's

Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture Fish Habitat Partnership, could potentially be the lifeline to remediate these problems in this Allegheny Highlands fishery.

Project development, landowner and partner meetings, mapping and background monitoring of water, macro-invertebrates and fish has been ongoing on the South Fork since 2007, with a primary objective of mitigating the sources of AMD with limestone beds and mitigate the acid deposition with limestone sand dosing to restore the pH and alkalinity to allow for a renewed brook trout population and overall aquatic life restoration.

The goal of the South Fork project is to restore the habitat of the waterway from its headwaters to the city of Johnstown, PA a stretch of 30 stream miles. The South Fork project currently covers four stream miles.

Partners In Action

The South Fork, Little Conemaugh River project is a multi-partner effort being co-ordinated by, the U.S. Office of Surface Mining, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pennsylvania Fish & Boat Commission, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, U.S. Department of Agriculture-NRCS and Trout Unlimited. These parties are together coordinating the restoration project and currently working on phase II, which consists of installation of limestone trenches along the access road to treat AMD discharge flow from this roadway into the stream.

Phase III of the project, to be completed in the Fall of 2011, will improve the river through installation of fish habitat structures along the stream banks where there is a significant threat of erosion. The structures, which will be installed by the Pennsylvania Fish & Boat Commission are designed to reduce sedimentation in the stream and provide adequate cover for brook trout.

Other partners involved in the project include; Cambria County Conservation District, Cambria Somerset Authority, Dunlo Rod and Gun Club, Highland Sewer and Water Authority and Little Conemaugh Watershed Association.

Additional work that has been completed, includes further limestone dosing by the Dunlo Rod & Gun Club on critical tributaries to the South Fork, as well as additional surveys of the macro-invertebrate population.

The Conemaugh River has been a focal point of educational programs established though The Cambria County Conservation District and in particular the South Fork Project. The Conservation District has an environmental Center providing environmental educational opportunities located in St. Michael, PA.

Students from Forest Hills Middle School in Salix, PA. have also incorporated The Conemaugh River within its educational programs, including field trips to some of the project sites.

(Below:) Malcolm Crittenden (PA. DEP) Displaying a brook trout fingerling in a net following electroshock survey at South Fork site.



Photo Credit:
Ryan Roberts
NFHAP

Photo Credit: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

TAB 14

National Fish Habitat Action Plan Board
Science and Data Committee
September 24, 2010

To: National Fish Habitat Action Plan Board
From: Gary E. Whelan, Co-chair Science and Data Committee
Subject: Decision Support Tool – Socioeconomic Variable Input

Background: The definition of a fishery includes the fish, the habitat, and the people that interact with both of the other components of a fishery. In recognition of this definition, the Science Team is beginning work on the Decision Support Tool that will combine the National Habitat Assessment scores with socioeconomic variables to help the Board and Partnerships make decisions on where to focus efforts. It is our intent to build a system that has a single or suite of scores that compresses a large amount of habitat condition and socioeconomic information into a useful decision tool for the Board and Partnerships. This tool will also help reduce potential bias in decisions and help focus attention on what is important to NFHAP.

The first step in designing this tool is to have a clear understanding of what the Board and Partnerships want this tool to do. Past discussions have included the need for the Board to set national priorities, by geography or stressor or some other factor, and the need for Partnerships (and possibly the Board) to rank projects. A well-defined purpose for this tool is essential for its design.

For this tool to continue its development, the Science Team needs a suite of potential socioeconomic variables of interest from the Board so we can determine what information is available to support them and how they can be employed in the analysis. For setting priorities, likely variables fall into the following groups: relationship to NFHAP principles, demographic, interest, economic and other. For ranking projects, there is an addition set of potential variables related to project success.

Action Requested: The Science Team is requesting Board and Partnership guidance on:

- What should the decision support tool do?
- What specific variables should be used to accomplish this purpose?
- Should the variables be combined into one score, and if so, how?
- How should the variables be weighted, if at all?

Additional Information: The following are some potential socioeconomic variables and potential scoring ideas for the Board's and Partnerships' consideration from the Science Team and Board staff. We expect the Board and Partnerships will have additional ones to add to these groups.

Relationship to NFHAP Principles

- Fish Habitat Goal (Protects, Rehabilitates or Enhances fish habitat). Efforts that protect intact systems get the highest score, then efforts that rehabilitate processes get the next lowest scores, and the lowest scores are for efforts that enhance engineered areas with no chance of rehabilitation.
- Number of system processes protected or improved – The greater the number of system processes protected or improved, the greater the score for this variable.
- Proximity to intact systems – The closer to intact systems, the higher the score for this variable.
- Proximity to continuing degradation – This variable could be scored in many ways.
- Magnitude of permanent habitat loss or fragmentation in area – The greater the permanent habitat fragmentation or direct habitat loss, the greater the score for rebuilding lost fisheries habitat.
- Ability to reverse fish habitat loss or degradation – The greater ability, the higher the score for this variable.
- Ability to protect intact fish habitat - The greater ability, the higher the score for this variable.
- Ability to protect long term aquatic ecosystem process – The longer the higher the score for this variable.

Demographic

- Distance to population centers – This variable could be scored in many ways.
- Distance to major universities – The closer the better as it would allow for specialized expertise to be employed and potentially inexpensive labor. The closer a project is to a major university, the greater the score for this variable.
- Population density - This variable could be scored in many ways.
- Land ownership – This variable could be scored in many ways. Access and land ownership patterns would be key considerations to scoring this variable.

Interest

- Numbers of interested groups – Generally, the greater number of entities interested involved, the higher the score for this variable.
- Interaction of project with other ongoing watershed or landscape-scale initiatives – The more an effort assists in accomplishing the goals of other efforts, the higher the score.
- Catalyst for future efforts – The more an effort creates interest for future efforts and partners, the greater the score for this variable.
- Community support – The greater community support for a effort, the higher the score for this variable.

Economic

- Recreational fishery improvement – The greater an effort is projected to improve a recreational fishery, the higher the score for this variable. The score for this variable would also depend on the geographic scale of the improved recreational fishery, i.e. regional improvements would get higher scores than local improvements.
- Commercial fishery improvement - The greater an effort is projected to improve a commercial fishery, the higher the score for this variable. The score for this variable would also depend on the geographic scale of the improved fishery, i.e. regional improvements would get higher scores than local improvements.
- Subsistence fishery improvement - The greater an effort is projected to improve a subsistence fishery, the higher the score for this variable. The score for this variable would also depend on the geographic scale of the improved fishery, i.e. regional improvements would get higher scores than local improvements.

Other

- Conservation of listed species at a state or federal level – The more an effort improves the status of a listed species, the greater the score for this variable.
- Benefits to inter-jurisdictional or highly migratory fish species – The more an effort benefits species that are inter-jurisdictional or highly migratory, the greater the score for this variable.
- Education Benefits – The more an effort increases system stewardship, support for fish habitat conservation, or environmental awareness, the greater the score for this variable.
- Iconic value of the resource – The greater the iconic value, the greater the score for this variable.
- Public access – The more there will be public access to the project area, the greater the score for this variable.
- Landscape affected by project – The greater the affected area, the higher the score for this variable.

For ranking specific projects many of the above variables could be used along with:

Project success

- Likelihood of success – The higher likelihood, the higher the score for this variable.
- Ability to recover degraded habitat – The greater ability, the higher the score for this variable.
- Certainty of casual relationship – The higher the certainty of response to the project or system, the higher the score for this variable.
- Project Innovation – The more innovative the project or approach, the greater the score for this variable. This would include development, field testing, evaluation, implementation, and monitoring of: novel conservation approaches or incentive systems, including market-based systems; promising conservation technologies, practices, systems, procedures, or approaches; and environmental soundness with

goals of environmental protection and natural resource enhancement. Additional criteria may include:

- A project introduces new conservation systems, approaches, and procedures from another geographic area or another scientific discipline.
- A project demonstrates and verifies the effectiveness, utility, affordability, and usability of a fish habitat conservation technology in the field.
- A project adapts new conservation technologies, practices, systems, procedures, approaches, and incentive systems to improve system performance and encourages broader adoption of the new technique.

Economic

- Estimated payback period – Generally, the shorter payback time would result in the higher the score for this variable.
- Financial Support from Conservation Partners – The greater the match, the higher the score for this variable.
- Benefit – Cost Ratio – The higher the ratio, the higher the score for this variable.