

2018 Fish Habitat Partnership Performance Evaluation

Introduction

The National Fish Habitat Partnership is an unprecedented effort to build and support partnerships that are strategically focused on fish habitat conservation. The National Fish Habitat Action Plan (Action Plan) guides this initiative and establishes processes for bringing partners together, challenging them to collaboratively advance strategic priorities, as well as measure and report on the outcomes of their conservation actions. The geographic scope and focus on fish habitat conservation distinguishes the National Fish Habitat Partnership from other more local fish habitat initiatives.

To uphold the high standards set by the Action Plan, the National Fish Habitat Board (Board) adopted a set of ten measures aimed at evaluating Fish Habitat Partnership performance levels for core operational functions (i.e., coordination, scientific assessment, strategic planning, data management, project administration, communications, and outreach). At its July 2012 meeting, the Board voted to begin the first “formal” performance evaluation of Fish Habitat Partnerships in January 2015, covering a 3-year period (2012-2014), and to repeat this process every 3 years thereafter.

Performance Evaluation Process

Each Fish Habitat Partnership will submit a completed performance evaluation form by May 31, 2018. A Board-appointed team will assess each partnership’s responses to the eleven measures and rate their level of performance using a scale of 1 (low) to 4 (high). The performance evaluation outcomes will be sent to each Fish Habitat Partnership for their review and response prior to being finalized by the team.

Performance measures 1–5 are focused on fish habitat conservation projects, which are defined as (a) approved actions taken for the conservation or management of aquatic habitat for fish and other aquatic organisms; (b) the provision of technical assistance to states, Indian tribes, or local communities to facilitate the development of strategies and priorities for aquatic habitat conservation; and, (c) the obtaining of real property interest in lands or waters, including water rights, if the obtaining of such interest is subject to terms and conditions that will ensure the real property will be administered for the long-term conservation of such lands and waters and the fish dependent thereon. Real property interest means any ownership interest in lands or a building or an object that is permanently affixed to land.

Please note that measure 5 is new and should be considered a ‘pilot’ measure for the 2018 FHP Performance Evaluation. Because this is a ‘pilot’ measure, it will not be formally scored by the Board, but you are encouraged to complete the question and self-score your FHP. The Board will consider the results of the 2018 FHP Performance Evaluation and determine whether to include this measure for formal scoring in a future performance evaluation process.

Performance Evaluation Form Instructions

Please provide a complete description of the information requested for each performance measure as the review team will rely on your responses when assessing your partnership's level of performance. The time period that is being covered by this performance evaluation is Federal Fiscal Years 2014-2016 (October 1, 2013 – September 30, 2016) for measures 1- 4 and calendar years 2015-2017 (January 1, 2015 – December 31, 2017) for measures 5-11.

Fish Habitat Performance Evaluation Form

1) For federal fiscal years 2014-2016, list the title of each of your partnership's fish habitat conservation¹ projects that: **See Excel spreadsheet for the EBTJV responses to this question.**

- a. Used National Fish Habitat Action Plan (NFHAP) funding sources (e.g., US Fish & Wildlife Service); or,
- b. Your partnership developed and were funded by non-NFHAP sources; or,
- c. Were neither funded by NFHAP sources nor developed by your partnership, but were formally endorsed by your partnership.

For each project listed, identify the project type (a, b, or c) as well as the specific FHP and/or national conservation priority (i.e., geographic focus areas, priority habitat types, key stressors or impairments) the project addresses

The following information should be provided for each Fish Habitat Conservation Project:

- Federal Fiscal Year the project was funded or endorsed
- Project title
- Project type
- Project location
- FHP conservation priority, as stated in your FHP's planning/strategic/action or implementation document(s), being addressed along with a narrative that details how it is being addressed by the project
- National conservation strategy/ies being addressed along with a narrative that details how it is being addressed by the project. The national conservation strategies can be found [here](#).
- Why the project was endorsed by your FHP (if applicable)

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

- a. Less than 70% of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focused on addressing FHP and/or national conservation strategies (1 point).
- b. 70% to 79% of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focused on addressing FHP

¹ "The use of the term conservation refers to tools for the protection, restoration, and enhancement of fish and their habitats." (National Fish Habitat Action Plan, 2nd Edition. Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Washington, D.C. 40 pp. 2012.)

- and/or national conservation strategies (2 points).
- c. 80% to 89% of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focused on addressing FHP and/or national conservation strategies (3 points).
- d. 90% or more of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focused on addressing FHP and/or national conservation strategies (4 points).

2) Describe the monitoring /evaluation plan being used to measure success in achieving the expected conservation outcomes* for each on-the-ground fish habitat conservation project listed under Performance Measure 1. Monitoring/evaluation plan descriptions are not required for communications, operations, or assessment projects for this criterion. (*Outcomes represent “a desired future state” while outputs are “immediate project products.” Providing fish in a stream unimpeded access to spawning habitat is a conservation outcome, whereas removing a manmade barrier is a project output.) [See Excel spreadsheet for the EBTJV responses to this question.](#)

The following information should be provided for each Fish Habitat Conservation Project:

- Project title
- Expected conservation outcome
- Description of the monitoring/evaluation plan

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

- a. Less than 70% of the on-the-ground fish habitat conservation projects have an effective monitoring/evaluation plan (1 point).
- b. 70% to 79% of the on-the-ground fish habitat conservation projects have an effective monitoring/evaluation plan (2 points).
- c. 80% to 89% of the on-the-ground fish habitat conservation projects have an effective monitoring/evaluation plan (3 points).
- d. 90% or more of the on-the-ground fish habitat conservation projects have an effective monitoring/evaluation plan (4 points).

3) Describe vulnerable fish habitat being protected **or** the causes of and processes influencing fish habitat decline that are being addressed by each fish habitat conservation project listed under Performance Measure 1. [See Excel spreadsheet for the EBTJV responses to this question.](#)

The following information should be provided for each Fish Habitat Conservation Project:

- Project title
- Vulnerable fish habitat being protected, as defined in your FHP's planning/strategic/action or implementation document(s) (e.g. placing land in conservation easement). Please include the vulnerable habitat description or link to the definition in your strategic plan.

OR

Causes of and processes influencing the vulnerable fish habitat decline being addressed (e.g. planting riparian buffers to minimize polluted run-off from entering a stream and negatively affecting water quality), recognizing that it may not be feasible for an individual FHP to address the larger cause or causes of the habitat decline.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

- a. Less than 70% of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats **or** addressing the causes/processes behind its decline (1 point).
- b. 70% to 79% of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats **or** addressing the causes/processes behind its decline (2 points).
- c. 80% to 89% of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats **or** addressing the causes/processes behind its decline (3 points).
- d. 90% or more of the fish habitat conservation projects clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats **or** addressing the causes/processes behind its decline (4 points).

4) For the fish habitat conservation projects listed under Performance Measure 1, what is the amount of NFHP funds (i.e., US Fish and Wildlife Service NFHP funds) allocated in support of these projects, and what is the total amount of funding from all other sources? [See Excel spreadsheet for the EBTJV responses to this question.](#)

The following information should be provided for each Fish Habitat Conservation Project:

- Project title
- Amount of NFHP funds supporting the project
- Amount of other federal funds supporting the project
- Amount of non-federal funds supporting the project
- If pertinent, also include a description of how funding the project assisted with generating additional sources of non-NFHP funding that is being targeted towards your partnership's priorities. For example, using NFHAP funds for a fish habitat conservation project that subsequently lead to a new funding source devoted to addressing one or more of your priorities.

Summary information:

- Provide the percentage of projects listed under Performance Measure 1 with higher than 2:1 non-NFHP:NFHP funding.
- Provide the total sum of non-NFHP funding for all projects listed under Performance Measure 1.
- Provide the total sum of NFHP funding for all projects listed under Performance Measure 1.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

- a. In aggregate, non-NFHP funding (including the value of new sources of funding that were generated by the project) for these fish habitat conservation projects was less than NFHAP funding (1 point).
- b. In aggregate, non-NFHP funding (including the value of new sources of funding that were generated by the project) for these fish habitat conservation projects was equal to or up to 1.5 times higher than NFHP funding (2 points).
- c. In aggregate, non-NFHP funding (including the value of new sources of funding that were generated by the project) for these fish habitat conservation projects was more than 1.5 and up to 2.0 times higher than NFHP (3 points).
- d. In aggregate, non-NFHP funding (including the value of new sources of funding that were generated by the project) for these fish habitat conservation projects was more than

2.0 times higher than NFHP funding (4 points).

5) PILOT MEASURE: NFHP National Conservation Strategies are intended as a framework to guide future actions and investment by the FHPs while allowing the FHPs to develop meaningful goals and approaches to conserve fish habitat. By establishing and communicating a national framework to partners, these strategies emphasize the need to focus on the process-level issues, not just the symptoms, to reverse the decline in fisheries and aquatic resources by directly addressing the contributing factors. Under each National Conservation Strategy Category below, please provide a short narrative indicating additional FHP activities (other than the on-the-ground projects listed in Performance Measure 1) that address the National Conservation Strategies. Examples of additional activities can be, but are not limited to, work accomplished such as development of Best Management Practices, outreach activities, partnerships that your FHP has created with local/regional organizations, collaborations, engagement of key audiences, or your FHP acting as a catalyst to promote a collective vision.

National Conservation Strategy Categories

Protection Category:

1. Protect intact and healthy waters.

Narrative on additional FHP activities that support this Strategy:

The Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture (EBTJV) activities that support protecting intact and healthy waters include incorporating this strategy into the EBTJV's range-wide habitat goals, state-level objectives, and key conservation actions. One of the EBTJV's range-wide habitat goals entails maintaining the status, or no net less, of subwatersheds (HUC12) classified as Intact. The EBTJV classifies an Intact subwatershed as one where $\geq 50\%$ of the aquatic habitat has wild Brook Trout present. The EBTJV maintains both range-wide and state [maps](#) depicting the location of Intact subwatersheds that are a priority for protection on its web portal so that interested parties can have ready access to their locations. One of the EBTJV's state level-objectives is to "improve protection of wild Brook Trout resources." These state-level objectives are part of an information packet that goes out to our wild Brook Trout conservation partners annually as part of the EBTJV's Request for Proposals process. A key conservation action identified by the EBTJV as a priority is to protect the "best of the best" habitat that supports existing, healthy wild Brook Trout populations. The best of the best habitat is defined by the EBTJV as having a subwatershed priority score that ranges between 1.30 and 1.66. [Subwatershed priority scores](#) represent the sum of probabilities that a specific subwatershed and its ten closest neighboring subwatersheds are classified as Intact.

The EBTJV's recently completed range-wide wild Brook Trout assessment data (2015) was used by Trout Unlimited to complete that organization's [Eastern Brook Trout Conservation Portfolio, Range-wide Habitat Integrity and Future Security Assessment, and Focal Area Risk and Opportunity Analysis](#) (2017). One of the range-wide conservation categories in the portfolio is a "secure strongholds strategy".

Restoration Category:

2. Restore hydrologic conditions for fish.

Narrative on additional FHP activities that support this Strategy:

In addition to having a state-level objective that calls for maintaining or restoring hydrologic regimes within the EBTJV's wild Brook Trout conservation strategy, our partnership regularly posts media stories about this type of conservation action on its [Facebook](#) page.

3. Reconnect fragmented fish habitats.

Narrative on additional FHP activities that support this Strategy:

The EBTJV considers this National Conservation Strategy as one of the most critical actions for conserving wild Brook Trout. This is demonstrated by the fact that six out of seven EBTJV NFHP Fish Habitat Conservation Projects listed in Question 1 of this FHP Performance Evaluation addresses this strategy. The EBTJV's [2014-2018 Business Plan](#) includes "eliminating fish passage barriers in catchments where habitat fragmentation is the primary threat to wild Brook Trout" as one of four conservation priorities. Additionally the EBTJV has collaborated with the Atlantic Coastal Fish Habitat Partnership (ACFHP) and Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership (SARP) to develop a process to reconnect fragmented fish habitat in drainages that occur within the overlapping geographic boundaries of our three Fish Habitat Partnerships.

4. Restore water quality.

Narrative on additional FHP activities that support this Strategy:

In addition to having a state-level objective that calls for mitigating factors that degrade water quality within the EBTJV's wild Brook Trout conservation strategy, our partnership regularly posts media stories about this type of conservation action on its [Facebook](#) page.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

- a. The protection category of national conservation strategies is clearly addressed by fish habitat conservation projects and activities (2 points).
- b. The restoration category of national conservation strategies is clearly addressed by fish habitat conservation projects and activities (2 points).

6) Please provide a copy of the criteria your partnership currently uses to prioritize fish habitat conservation projects for funding.

[EBTJV Project Review Criteria](#) used during 2017 to evaluate Fish Habitat Conservation Project Applications submitted for federal fiscal year 2018 FWS-NFHP funding support considerations.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure. The NFHP Board's minimum benchmark set of criteria can be found [here](#).

- a. Less than 70% of the Board's minimum benchmark set of criteria are being used by the partnership to prioritize fish habitat conservation projects for funding (1 point).
- b. 70% to 79% of the Board's minimum benchmark set of criteria are being used by the partnership to prioritize fish habitat conservation projects for funding (2 points).
- c. 80% to 89% of the Board's minimum benchmark set of criteria are being used by the partnership to prioritize fish habitat conservation projects for funding (3 points).
- d. 90% or more of the Board's minimum benchmark set of criteria are being used by the partnership to prioritize fish habitat conservation projects for funding (4 points).

7) Describe the ways your partnership has engaged with neighboring/overlapping Fish Habitat Partnerships and/or other natural resource conservation entities during the past three years (2015-2017) and what these engagements produced for outcomes (e.g. reduced redundancy, enhanced message delivery or access to a larger outreach audience, greater geographic coverage).

The following information should be included in your response:

- Name of the Fish Habitat Partnership/ natural resource conservation entity engaged (examples of a 'conservation entity' include, but not are limited to: state resource agencies, Landscape Conservation Cooperatives, land trusts, and non-government organizations).
- Type of engagement activity or activities (building awareness, coordination, collaboration) that occurred with each Fish Habitat Partnership/regional natural resource conservation entity.
- The outcome achieved by each engagement activity.

During the past three years (2015-2017) the EBTJV continued its collaborative working relationships with ACFHP and SARP on our three partnerships [Whitewater to Bluewater](#) Initiative that first began back in 2012. During this three year period our three FHPs identified the basins that were located within our collective geographic boundaries and finalized a process for determining priority connectivity focal areas within those areas of overlap.

The EBTJV collaborated with the Appalachian Landscape Conservation (AppLCC) to develop an innovative [riparian planting and restoration decision support tool](#) and assisted with establishing training strategies for users of this important tool.

The EBTJV collaborated with the North Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative (NALCC) to complete a Brook Trout model and [Decision Support Tool](#) available for use by those who manage wild Brook Trout resources within the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

The EBTJV collaborated with the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) to develop a [management strategy](#) aimed at achieving the Brook Trout outcome identified in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement signed in June 2014. The EBTJV also participated on the CBP's Brook Trout Action Team, which is charged with developing the Brook Trout Management Strategy annual works plans.

The EBTJV participated in periodic conference calls with members of ACFHP, SARP, Ohio River Basin Fish Habitat Partnership (ORBFHP), and AppLCC that entailed providing updates on the respective organization's activities, discussing opportunities to collaborate, and furthering coordination among these regional conservation partnerships.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure and the score will be cumulative, with each type of outcome (a-d)

listed below being worth 1 point. The maximum number of 4 points will be assigned if a Fish Habitat Partnership has achieved outcomes for all four criteria.

- a. The outcomes of engagement with neighboring/overlapping FHPs and/or other natural resource conservation entities included an exchange of information about their respective programs (1 point).
- b. The outcomes of engagement with neighboring/overlapping FHPs and/or other natural resource conservation entities improved mutual capacity for communications and outreach (1 point).
- c. The outcomes of engagement with neighboring/overlapping FHPs and/or other natural resource conservation entities improved the development or delivery of scientific information and products (1 point).
- d. The outcomes of engagement with neighboring/overlapping FHPs and/or other regional natural resource conservation entities included generating collaboration that improved the delivery of an on-the-ground conservation project (1 point).

8) Describe how your partnership uses resource condition assessment and/or analysis results to determine your conservation priorities and to identify the actions they require.

The following information should be included in your response:

- Title of the resource condition assessment(s) and/or analysis(es) used by your partnership along with the date(s) it (they) were completed.
- A listing of the conservation priorities, and the actions they require, determined by the resource condition assessment and/or analysis results.

The EBTJV completed its second [range-wide status assessment of wild Brook Trout](#) in 2015. Results of this assessment led to our partnership revising its [Eastern Brook Trout: Roadmap to Restoration \(2nd Edition\)](#). The 2015 assessment findings were also used to modify the EBTJV's range-wide habitat goals and objectives as well as our partnership's key conservation actions. Additionally, the assessment data led to the development of new individual [State maps](#) depicting the location of wild Brook Trout patches and new data layers were added to the EBTJV's [Brook Trout Integrated Spatial Data and Tools](#), our web-based platform.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure. The maximum number of 4 points will be assigned if a Fish Habitat Partnership has achieved outcomes for criteria b-d, otherwise points are assigned and totaled across all criteria met.

- a. The partnership has not used resource condition assessment and/or analysis results to assist with determining their conservation priorities and identifying the actions they require (0 points).
- b. The partnership has used resource condition assessment and/or analysis results to assist with either determining their conservation priorities or identifying the actions they require (2 points).
- c. The partnership has used resource condition assessment and/or analysis results to assist with determining both their conservation priorities and identifying the actions they require (1 point).
- d. The partnership has further refined their conservation priorities and/or the actions they require through best available resource condition assessment and/or analysis results (1 point).

9) Describe your partnership's outreach activities aimed at: 1) sharing information about your strategic priorities (i.e., geographic focus areas, habitat types, key stressors or impairments); 2) building broader visibility among local and regional partners; 3) tailoring events to garner media coverage; and 4) strengthening relationships with policy-makers. (Note: strengthening relationships with policy-makers may include activities such as, but not limited to, your FHP providing information to members of legislatures, individuals at state or federal governmental agencies, AFWA regional association committee or leadership, etc.)

One of the four conservation emphases in the EBTJV Business Plan is "Raising awareness on the plight of wild Brook Trout among targeted audiences." The EBTJV's primary strategy for addressing this priority is posting media stories about Brook Trout conservation on the partnership's [Facebook](#) page. From January 2015 to December 2017, the EBTJV posted 265 Brook Trout conservation-related media stories that collectively generated more than 225,600 views. The number of individuals who "like" the EBTJV Facebook page went from 1,758 to 2,709 during this 3-year period, a 54% increase.

The EBTJV's collaborations with ACFHP, SARP, ORBFHP, AppLCC, NALCC, and the CBP provided venues for sharing EBTJV Brook Trout assessment data, range-wide habitat goals and objectives, and key conservation actions as part of our partnerships efforts to build broader visibility among these regional partners.

The Performance Review Team will use the outreach criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure. Fish Habitat Partnerships whose activities include only one of these criteria will receive 1 point; use of two criteria will receive 2 points; use of three criteria will receive 3 points; and, use of all four criteria will receive 4 points.

- a. The partnership's outreach activities were limited to information sharing (1 point).
- b. The partnership's outreach activities included building broader visibility among local and regional partners (1 point).
- c. The partnership's outreach activities included events to garner media coverage (1 point).
- d. The partnership's outreach activities included strengthening relationships with policy-makers (1 point).

10) Describe the ways your partnership coordinated its aquatic resource data and regional assessment information with the NFHP Science and Data Committee during the past 3 years (2015-2017).

The following information/documents should be included in your response:

- The regional data sets and/or conservation outcomes you provided for integration into the NFHP National Assessment. Please provide a link to where the dataset(s) are housed or may be viewed (do not attach datasets to this report).
- Documents your partnership produced that provide details about the effectiveness of the conservation outcomes supported by your partnership.

The EBTJV notified the Data Manager for the NFHP Science and Data committee that its catchment assessment data layer, finalized range-wide in late 2015, was available and downloadable from the partnerships [Brook Trout Integrated Spatial Data and Tools](#). This web-based map viewer also contains three other downloadable data layers from the EBTJV catchment assessment, Wild Trout Habitat Patches, Brook Trout Habitat Patches, and Brook Trout Patch Vulnerability.

The EBTJV also integrated the Fish Habitat Risk Assessment information from the NFHP 2015 National Assessment into its [Eastern Brook Trout: Roadmap to Restoration \(2nd Edition\)](#), including the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Southeast Atlantic regions, along with the risk of current habitat degradation data within our partnership's geographic boundaries.

The EBTJV also submitted its responses to the NFHP's Science and Data Committee survey on the direction for the next National Assessment.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure with a total of 4 points maximum.

- a. The FHP coordinated with the NFHP Science and Data Committee by providing FHP science and data updates, either in writing or verbally, to the NFHP Science and Data Committee at minimum twice per year (1 point).
- b. The FHP provided datasets to the NFHP Science and Data Committee, either those directly requested by the NFHP Science and Data Committee or new datasets developed by the FHP, for future inclusion in the National Fish Assessment (1 point).
- c. The FHP directly involved and worked with the NFHP Science and Data Committee in the development of FHP habitat assessment products or in ensuring the National Assessment properly addressed FHP needs (1 point).
- d. The FHP provided either data products or written materials directly used in the National Fish Habitat Assessment Report (1 point).

Optional Points that could be used to replace points lost above.

- e. The FHP provided reviews and comments of the 2015 National Assessment products (1

- point).
- f. The FHP provided scoping information to assist in the development of the next National Assessment (1 point).
 - g. The FHP responded to the Science and Data Committee survey on the direction for the next National Assessment (1 point).

11) List your partnership's conservation priorities (i.e., geographic focus areas, habitat types, key stressors or impairments) and describe the progress that has been made toward addressing these priorities during the past 3 years (2015-2017).

The following information should be included in your response:

- Separate listings for short-term and long-term conservation priorities.
- Target dates for achieving each conservation priority.
- Current status of achieving each conservation priority by its target date (i.e. ahead of schedule, on schedule, behind schedule).
- Efforts underway within the partnership that are focused on addressing each conservation priority.

The EBTJV has a set of priority habitat goals (long-term) and associated priority objectives (short-term) intended to achieve those goals. The EBTJV determined that the appropriate time scale to measure long-term success was at 15-year intervals and 5-year intervals were established for tracking short-term progress. Both the long-term priority habitat goals and short-term habitat objectives were developed from the findings of our partnership's first Brook Trout status assessment (2006) that was conducted at the subwatershed scale (HUC12). This assessment resulted in classifying 790 subwatersheds as Intact ($\geq 50\%$ of the subwatershed's aquatic habitat had wild Brook Trout present), 1,503 were classified as Reduced (wild Brook Trout were present but in $<50\%$ of the subwatershed's aquatic habitat), and 1,116 subwatersheds were classified as Extirpated (wild Brook Trout were absent from a subwatershed where they had a historical presence). Additionally, there were 1,051 subwatersheds that were given a predicted classification because there was only qualitative wild Brook Trout status data available.

EBTJV Priority Habitat Goals (Target Date – 2025):

1. Increase the number of subwatersheds classified as Intact by 10%.
2. Improve the conditions in 30% of the subwatersheds classified as Reduced.
3. Establish self-sustaining Brook Trout populations in 10% of subwatersheds classified as Extirpated.
4. Validate the predicted classification of all subwatersheds where quantitative Brook Trout presence/absence data is lacking.

EBTJV Priority Habitat Objectives (Target Date -2017):

1. Improve the status of wild Brook Trout in 7 Reduced subwatersheds to Intact classification.
2. Strengthen the presence of wild Brook Trout populations in 63 subwatersheds classified as Reduced.
3. Establish self-sustaining wild Brook Trout populations in 8 subwatersheds classified as Extirpated.
4. Validate the predictive Brook Trout status model by assessing 50% of subwatersheds where

quantitative Brook Trout presence/absence data is lacking.

While the EBTJV had extensive discussions when developing both our long- and short-term habitat priorities, we struggled with determining a clear process for tracking progress towards achieving these targets. It was initially assumed that regional workgroups (Northern, Mid-Atlantic, and Southern) would be responsible for identifying the annual progress being made, but these workgroups were unable to come up with a defensible way to measure our “moving the needle”, primarily because affecting change at the subwatershed scale was found to be difficult at best. Table 1 provides a general summary of where our partnership estimates we are with regards to achieving each of our short-term Priority Habitat Objectives:

Table 1

Priority Habitat Objective	Target	Known Number Addressed	Current Achievement Status
1	7	15	Ahead of Schedule
2	63	77	Ahead of Schedule
3	8	12	Ahead of Schedule
4	526	12+	Behind Schedule

As far as the EBTJV’s long-term priority Habitat Goals, Table 2 provides insights into where our partnership currently stands in achieving its priority Habitat Goals.

Table 2

Priority Habitat Goal	Target Outcome	Change to Date	Current Achievement Status
1	79	15	Behind Schedule
2	450	77	Behind Schedule
3	112	12	Behind Schedule
4	1,051	12+	Behind Schedule

As was mentioned previously, the EBTJV was struggling with its capacity to affect and measure change in the status of wild Brook Trout at the subwatershed scale (HUC12) so our partnership recently completed (2015) its second range-wide assessment. However, this time it was conducted at the catchment scale because EBTJV partners felt that an assessment at a finer scale would yield better guidance in establishing a more workable set of wild Brook Trout conservation priorities, objectives, and strategies. Adopted by the EBTJV Steering Committee in 2017, Table 3 contains our partnership’s new set of priority habitat goals and objectives. It is anticipated that the EBTJV will be better positioned to track our progress in achieving these measures of success in the years ahead.

Table 3

Priority Habitat Goal	Priority Habitat Objective
Increase the average size (km ²) of wild Brook Trout patches, which is currently 19 km ²	Increase the size (km ²) of 30 wild Brook Trout patches by the year 2022.
Restore wild Brook Trout to catchments where they were extirpated	Establish wild Brook Trout in 15 extirpated catchments by the year 2022.
Maintain the current number of wild Brook Trout patches (i.e. no net loss)	-Retain at least 6,022 allopatric wild Brook Trout patches (1.1) across the EBTJV geographic range by the year 2022. -Retain at least 3,838 sympatric wild Brook Trout patches (1.2, 1.3, and 1.4) across the EBTJV geographic range by the year 2022.
Increase connectivity within and among wild Brook Trout catchments	Complete Aquatic Organism Passage projects within 45 wild Brook Trout catchments by 2022.

The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

- a. Less than 50% of the partnership’s conservation priorities are on track for achievement by their target dates (1 point).
- b. 50% to 69% of the partnership’s conservation priorities are on track for achievement by their target dates (2 points).
- c. 70% to 89% of the partnership’s conservation priorities are on track for achievement by their target dates (3 points).
- d. 90% or more of the partnership’s conservation priorities are on track for achievement by their target dates (4 points).