



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

Fish Habitat Partnership:

Contact Person Name:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

General Instructions

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

NFHAP Regional and National Coordinator List

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Enter your responses in the space provided below.

General Guidance for Completing Section 2. Accomplishments Report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Leveraging of FWS Project Funds

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

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

Complete table adding rows for additional projects as needed.

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

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

8. Conservation Actions and Project Outcomes

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

Choose one and provide narrative responses below.

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

Narrative responses (max. 700 characters/project)

Supplemental Guidance for Selected Performance Criterion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On-the-Ground Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Protection Projects

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

Education and Outreach Projects and Species or Habitat Assessment Projects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Leveraging cannot include:

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

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

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

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

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

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