

**West Area – Washington State
FY2011 WHIP RANKING CRITERIA**

Description:

WASHINGTON STATE - WEST AREA 2011 WHIP RANKING

In Washington State, WHIP will be used on lands where fish and wildlife habitat has been negatively impacted by agricultural activities, forestry activities, or invasive species.

One or more eligible WHIP cost-shared conservation practice(s) will be applied to address each Local Issue, State Issue, or National Priorities question answered yes.

National Priorities:

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Number	Question	Points
1	a. Retain wildlife and plant benefits on land exiting the Conservation Reserve Program?	40
1	b. Address and support existing conservation initiatives such as but not limited to the following or new conservation initiatives that support State, National or tribal fish or wildlife plans: Sage Grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken, Longleaf Pine, New England-New York Forestry?	40
1	c. Benefit federally listed threatened and endangered, at-risk, candidate, fish or wildlife species of concern?	20
1	d. Benefit prioritized native habitat critical to a fish or wildlife species?	20
1	e. Increase, improve or establish pollinator habitat?	20
1	f. Eradicate or control prioritized noxious or invasive species?	20
1	g. Benefit declining or important aquatic wildlife species prioritized in the State WHIP Plan?	20
1	h. Implement conservation practices which benefit prioritized fish or wildlife species in forested areas?	15
1	i. Establish habitat on pivot corners and irregular areas on agricultural land?	10
1	j. Provide self-sustaining habitat for prioritized fish and wildlife while reducing net carbon emissions or boosting carbon storage (e.g., warm season perennial grasses, trees or shrubs)?	10
1	k. Benefit migration and other movement corridors for prioritized wildlife?	15
2	a. Complete habitat development within the first two years of the agreement?	20

State Issues:

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Sub-Heading Number	Question Number	Question	Points
10		Likelihood of Success: Select "yes" only one time for next three questions	
	1	Will the likelihood of success of the project be HIGH, with few or no habitat restoration problems during and after the establishment period?	20
	2	Will the likelihood of success of the project be MEDIUM, with moderate problems associated with the restoration activity?	5
	3	Will the likelihood of success of the project be LOW, with a high degree of disturbance, competition, indefinite use of irrigation, and/or continued maintenance of structures?	1
20		O and M Cost: Select "yes" only one time for next three questions	
	4	Will the cost of Operations and Maintenance be LOW, with minimal or no maintenance after establishment?	20
	5	Will the cost of Operations and Maintenance be MEDIUM, with structures, systems, or plantings requiring periodic (less than annual) maintenance or replacement?	10
	6	Will the cost of Operations and Maintenance (O&M) be HIGH, with structures, systems, or plantings requiring at least annual maintenance and/or management?	4
30		Select "yes" to all that apply:	
	7	Will the applicant (with landowner agreement) allow public access for educational or recreational use, such as outdoor recreation site, outdoor classroom, and/or onsite research?	10
	8	Will all contracted practices be vegetative or non-engineering type practices, or if engineering practices are included will the participant supply the engineering design certified by a licensed professional engineer? (This includes producer-selected TSP designs)	30
	9	Is applicant certified as Socially Disadvantaged, Beginning, or Limited Resource Farmer/Rancher?	20

Local Issues:

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Sub-Heading Number	Question Number	Question	Points
1		Answer "Yes" to only one of the following two questions:	
	1	Will the prairie or oak restoration/enhancement project occur within 1 mile of another project where the primary objective is to manage for native prairie or oak habitat?	118
	2	Is the prairie or oak restoration/enhancement project isolated from other projects (ie. greater than 1 mile) where the primary objective is to manage for native prairie or oak habitat?	89
2		Answer "Each of the following" questions:	
	3	Will the project restore or enhance wetland habitat by establishing or managing vegetation, by adding snags or down logs, by enhancing micro topography, or by restoring hydrologic connectivity?	36
	4	Will the project restore or enhance riparian habitat by establishing or managing native vegetation or by adding snags or down logs?	36
	5	Will the project result in restoration or enhancement of estuarine or near shore habitats?	118
	6	Will the project result in forage establishment/improvement for Roosevelt Elk?	36
	7	Will the applicant enhance vegetation that is beneficial to wildlife and enhances habitat diversity in existing upland forest?	36
	8	Will the applicant enhance standing snag or downed wood habitat in existing upland forest?	36
3		Answer "Yes" to only one of the following two questions:	
	9	Will the project benefit 1-3 priority fish, wildlife or plant species? Refer to PHS template or local habitat biologists for site specific data.	12
	10	Will the project benefit 4 or more priority fish, wildlife or plant species? Refer to PHS template or local habitat biologists for site specific data.	24
4		Answer "Each of the following" questions:	
	11	Will the applicant establish a Field Border, Hedgerow, or Conservation Cover planting to provide food and cover for wildlife and pollinator/beneficial insects?	48
	12	If the project will control invasive species to facilitate restoration of a priority WHIP habitat type, will the effort be coordinated on a watershed or with other comprehensive control effort?	27
	13	Will the project result in improvement of an instream habitat type such as cover, spawning gravel, or by removal of manmade instream structure?	12
5		Answer "Yes" to only one of the following three questions:	
	14	Has the NRCS Engineering analysis of the stream project determined the complexity of design and installation to be low? (score non-engineering projects here)	59
	15	Has the NRCS Engineering analysis of the stream project determined the complexity of design and installation to be moderate?	6
	16	Has the NRCS Engineering analysis of the stream project determined the complexity of design and installation to be high?	1