Appendix A

CRITERIA FOR "FIRST SORT" OF POTENTIAL RESTORATION ACTIONS

Instructions:

- To be categorized as "Include," a candidate project would need to meet all of Criteria (1) – (4) below.
- If it is unclear whether the candidate project meets the requirements for the "Include" category, it would be categorized as "Maybe Include." (Projects for which currently available information is insufficient to assess the fit with FISH Plan goals would be put in this category.)
- If it is clear that the candidate project does not meet the requirements for the "Include" category, it would be categorized as "Omit." However, TSC doubts regarding whether or not the candidate project meets Criteria #4 by itself is not sufficient to prevent its inclusion in the "Maybe Include" category. If the potential project is valuable from a scientific perspective, broader input regarding implementability should be elicited.
- Fish species "of priority management concern" are steelhead, fall-run chinook salmon, and splittail. Fish species "of management concern" include these as well as American shad, striped bass, and other native fish.

Criteria:

1. **Addresses Needs/Stressors of Priority Species**. Reviewers conclude that the project is likely to benefit LAR fish species of highest priority management concern. Projects can demonstrate this characteristic by:
   (a) Reducing one or more variables causing considerable stress to LAR fish species of priority management concern (or being part of an inter-related set of actions that collectively do so); and/or
   (b) Restoring or protecting natural processes, functions, or conditions of importance to priority fish species. This includes preventing relatively irreversible disruptive changes to the habitat of priority fish species and/or halting or avoiding negative impacts associated with the status quo. Generally, recommended projects should not preclude other key habitat enhancement opportunities.
2. **High Scientific Merit / Data Benefits/Learning Potential**. An explicitly-articulated conceptual model[1] indicates that the proposed project is likely to make a significant contribution to the scientific understanding and/or management of LAR aquatic habitat and/or LAR fish species of priority management concern.
3. **Geographic Scope.** Proposed action falls within the RCMP's geographic scope.[2]
4. **Public Support/Implementability/Ripeness.** Reviewers believe that the proposed action would enjoy broad public support and would be relatively manageable to implement, given regulatory, political considerations.

---

[1] In this context, "conceptual model" refers to a basic explanation for why the proposed action is expected to produce benefits (e.g., the relationship of the proposed action to a particular stressor affecting a particular life stage of a particular species of fish). The conceptual model may be only a few sentences, but describes what is expected to result from the proposed action and why. It provides a reference point for learning and adaptive management based on the results obtained from carrying out the proposed action.

[2] FISH Plan recommendations may include a section discussing/acknowledging potential actions outside the RCMP's geographic scope if the TSC believes they would have high positive impacts on LAR fish species of priority management concern.

Appendix B

CRITERIA FOR DETAILED SCORING OF POTENTIAL RESTORATION ACTIONS

Instructions:

- Each "Yes" or "Maybe" candidate project should be assessed with respect to each of the 9 detailed scoring criteria below.
- For each of the detailed scoring criteria, please assign a score between 0 (low) and 2 (high) for the candidate project based on available information. The items listed in bulleted form beneath each of the detailed scoring criteria represent some of the ways that a potential project might demonstrate that it met the criteria in question. These bulleted items should be considered by TSC members in assigning a score to the project regarding that particular criteria.
- Results will be used to inform TSC discussion, but will not be used as the sole determination of priorities.
- Following the scoring exercise, TSC professional judgment will be sought regarding whether the results are well-founded, based on the professional knowledge and experience of TSC members. The TSC recommendation subsequently will be submitted to the FWG for further discussion, drawing upon the professional knowledge and experience of FWG members (particularly with regard to implementability).
- Fish species "of priority management concern" are steelhead, fall-run chinook salmon, and splittail. Fish species "of management concern" include these as well as American shad, striped bass, and other native fish.

Criteria:

1. **Addresses Needs of Priority Species.**   Score: ____ (0-2)
    - Project is likely to increase/preserve salmonid rearing habitat.
    - Project is likely to increase salmonid spawning habitat quantity.
    - Project is likely to increase salmonid spawning habitat quality and incubation success.
    - Project is likely to promote/preserve genetic integrity of salmonid populations.
    - Project is likely to improve salmonid outmigrant success.
    - Project is likely to significantly reduce or eliminate predator impacts on fish species of priority management concern.
    - Project is likely to increase splittail spawning habitat.
    - Project is likely to increase splittail rearing habitat.
    - Project is expected to assist in the recovery of listed species.
    - Project is unlikely to adversely affect listed species.

2. **Addresses Major Stressor.**   Score: ____ (0-2)
    - Project is likely to reduce temperature-related stressors on priority fish species (steelhead, fall-run chinook and/or splittail).
    - Project is likely to reduce flow-related stressors on priority fish species.
    - Project is likely to reduce physical habitat-related stressors on priority fish species.

3. **High Species Conservation Value.**   Score: ____ (0-2)
    - Without the project, impacts to LAR fish species of priority management concern are expected to be significant.
    - Pursuit of this project would not preclude other key habitat enhancement opportunities.

4. **High Habitat Enhancement/Management Value.**   Score: ____ (0-2)
    - Project is likely to have high management value for priority fish species.
    - Project is likely to have beneficial habitat values for priority fish species.

5. **High Scientific Merit.**   Score: ____ (0-2)
    - There is a strong scientific basis for anticipating that the project will have positive impacts on LAR fish species of priority management concern and/or their habitat (e.g., a high probability of success).

6. **High Data Benefits/Learning Potential.**   **Score: ____ (0-2)**
   - Project is likely to make a significant contribution to scientific understanding of LAR aquatic habitat and/or LAR fish species of priority management concern.
   - Project is likely to make a significant contribution to management of LAR aquatic habitat and/or fish species of priority management concern.
   - Project is likely to make a significant contribution that can be used to inform management decisions in a relatively short timeframe.

7. **Multiple and/or Leveraged Benefits.**   **Score: ____ (0-2)**
   - Project is likely to benefit multiple LAR fish species of management concern.
   - Project is likely to leverage benefits to LAR aquatic habitat, fish species of priority management concern, and/or LAR ecosystem as a whole through linkages with other past, current, or anticipated restoration actions.

8. **Durability/Sustainability.**   **Score: ____ (0-2)**
   - Project is likely to be self-sustaining/self-maintaining at all anticipated flows.
   - Project is likely to provide sustained benefits.
   - Project is likely to provide systemic benefits.

9. **Project Implementation Criteria.**   **Score: ____ (0-2)**
   - Project is likely to enjoy broad public support (including the support of relevant landowners/entities with jurisdiction over affected resources).
   - Project implementation would be manageable, given regulatory and political considerations.
   - Project effectiveness can be monitored and evaluated.
   - Project site is readily accessible.