

VSP 5 Year Report for Pend Oreille County

Report Period Ending: 2/2/2021

Submitter Name
Submitter Phone
Submitter Email

Has the county work group approved the content and submittal of this report? Yes No

Date of Approval

PROTECTION Goals

- The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years.
- The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's PROTECTION goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years.

ENHANCEMENT Goals

- The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have been met during the past five years.
- The watershed work group asserts that the work plan's ENHANCEMENT goals and benchmarks have NOT been met during the past five years.

Strategies and Performance Metrics, Benchmark Results and Monitoring

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using practices that: provide direct protections to wetlands/wetland buffers; reduce erosion and improving water storage and filtration; reduce inputs from runoff

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,388 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Yes No

Comments

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
		Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using practices that: provide direct protections to wetlands/wetland buffers; reduce erosion and improving water storage and filtration; reduce inputs from runoff	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,388 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using practices that: provide direct protections to wetlands/wetland buffers; reduce erosion and improving water storage and filtration; reduce inputs from runoff	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,388 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
59 - Colville

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using practices that: provide direct protections to wetlands/wetland buffers; reduce erosion and improving water storage and filtration; reduce inputs from runoff	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,388 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using practices that: provide direct protections to wetlands/wetland buffers; reduce erosion and improving water storage and filtration; reduce inputs from runoff	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,388 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and voluntarily enhance acres managed using practices that: provide direct protections to wetlands/wetland buffers; reduce erosion and improving water storage and filtration; reduce inputs from runoff	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,388 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	59 - Colville

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	59 - Colville

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	59 - Colville

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Frequently Flooded
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Geologic Hazard
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Wetlands
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.	62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions	Critical Aquifer Recharge
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio	55 - Little Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

<p>Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions</p> <p>Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio</p>	<p>Frequently Flooded</p> <p>59 - Colville</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

<p>Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions</p> <p>Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio</p>	<p>Geologic Hazard</p> <p>59 - Colville</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

<p>Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions</p> <p>Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio</p>	<p>Wetlands</p> <p>59 - Colville</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

<p>Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions</p> <p>Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio</p>	<p>Critical Aquifer Recharge</p> <p>61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reduction)

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that: restore or create new habitat structures; limit trampling of habitat; prevent unintentional conversion of shrub-steppe habitat; reduce erosion and wildfire risk; protect fish-bearing streams

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard
57 - Middle Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Yes No

Comments

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded
62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures. Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures. Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities. Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities. Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard
62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Yes No

Comments

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Yes No

Comments

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Yes No

Comments

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Yes No

Comments

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Protect and/or enhance FFAs directly and protect and/or enhance acres managed using techniques that: limit soil compaction or trampling; reduce erosion and improve water storage and filtration

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of habitat management, livestock/range management, and pest management stewardship practices with over 3,796 acres, 140 structures/facilities, and 123 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Yes No

Comments

Habitat Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 3,420 acres, 100 feet, and 110 structures.
 Habitat Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 1,922 acres, 59 feet, and 64 structures.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

Accomplishment

Status

N/A

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Monitoring sufficient?

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Geologic Hazard

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Wetlands

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
55 - Little Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Protect and/or enhance acres managed to: protect shallow groundwater wells by managing chemical and nutrient input controls; promote natural groundwater filtration functions; improve water conservation	Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 249 acres, 1 structure, and 242 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).	Exceeded

<u>Benchmark Met?</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Adaptive Management?</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres. Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres. Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure. Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<u>Benchmark Monitoring</u>	<u>Monitoring sufficient?</u>
2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring) Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.		N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Geologic Hazard

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions
Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Critical Aquifer Recharge

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions
Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

Frequently Flooded

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands

Benchmark: 1 - No net loss of acres managed under stewardship practices; no net loss of feet or units managed for protection.

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Frequently Flooded

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

55 - Little Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
 Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

57 - Middle Spokane

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

59 - Colville

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
 Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Critical Aquifer Recharge

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Frequently Flooded

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Protect and/or enhance acres managed using practices that promote water quality, hydrology, soil, and habitat functions by reducing erosion and wildfire risk, and improving water storage and filtration

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of pest management and soil management stewardship practices with over 3,126 acres, 26 structures, and 34,254 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan).

Exceeded

Benchmark Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Forest Understory Management Protection: Exceeded benchmark by over 2,800 acres and 5 plans.
 Forest Understory Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 2,660 acres and 5 plans.
 Livestock/Range Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 24 facilities.
 Livestock/Range Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 15 acres and 16 facilities.
 Pest Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 205 acres.
 Pest Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 127 acres.
 Soil Management Protection: Benchmark exceeded by over 34 acres, 32,700 feet, and 1 structure.
 Soil Management Enhancement: Benchmark exceeded by over 23 acres and 660 feet. Benchmark met with 1 structure.

Yes No

Benchmark Monitoring

Monitoring sufficient?

2011 – 2021 NRCS and CD-led programs reported data (conservation acres monitoring)
 Sample verification (randomly selected sample of 10% of reported projects)

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Benchmark: 2 - Enrolled enhancement units (e.g., acres and feet) are sufficient to offset identified agricultural degradation and maintain baseline conditions based on: implemented projects from 2011 to 2017, and excluded protection benchmarks (estimated annual reductio

Wetlands

62 - Pend Oreille

Strategy/Metric Description

Accomplishment

Status

Goal and Benchmark do not apply to this Critical Area.

N/A

Goal Results

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Wetlands

55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Wetlands

57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Wetlands

59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Wetlands

61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Wetlands

62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge

55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Frequently Flooded
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Frequently Flooded
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Frequently Flooded
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Geologic Hazard
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Geologic Hazard
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Geologic Hazard
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Geologic Hazard
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 1 - Protect and/or enhance wetland functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Wetlands
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Wetlands
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Frequently Flooded
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Geologic Hazard
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 2 - Protect and/or enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Wetlands
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Wetlands
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Frequently Flooded
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Frequently Flooded**
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Frequently Flooded**
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Frequently Flooded**
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Geologic Hazard**
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Geologic Hazard**
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Geologic Hazard**
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Geologic Hazard**
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions **Geologic Hazard**
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 3 - Protect and/or enhance frequently flooded area functions

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

**Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

**Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

**Wetlands
59 - Colville**

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Wetlands
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions

Frequently Flooded
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Frequently Flooded
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Frequently Flooded
59 - Colville

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Frequently Flooded
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Frequently Flooded
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Geologic Hazard
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Geologic Hazard
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Geologic Hazard
59 - Colville

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions **Geologic Hazard
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions **Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions **Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions **Fish and Wildlife Habitat
59 - Colville**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions **Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 4 - Protect and/or enhance critical aquifer recharge area functions **Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Wetlands
55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Wetlands
57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Wetlands
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Critical Aquifer Recharge
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Comments

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Frequently Flooded 55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Frequently Flooded 57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Frequently Flooded 59 - Colville**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Frequently Flooded 61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Frequently Flooded 62 - Pend Oreille**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Geologic Hazard 55 - Little Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Geologic Hazard 57 - Middle Spokane**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions **Geologic Hazard 59 - Colville**

Goal Met? Yes No **Comments** Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met. **Adaptive Management?** Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Geologic Hazard
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
55 - Little Spokane

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
57 - Middle Spokane

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
59 - Colville

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
61 - Upper Lake Roosevelt

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Goal: 5 - Protect and/or enhance geologically hazardous area (erosion hazard area) functions

Fish and Wildlife Habitat
62 - Pend Oreille

Goal Met?

Yes No

Comments

Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Adaptive Management?

Yes No

Participation Strategies and Performance Metrics

Enter your best estimate of the number of Producers in the County watersheds:

288

Goal: 6 - Promote producer participation in voluntary stewardship of agricultural lands and critical areas to meet the protection and/or enhancement benchmarks and protect critical areas functions and values at a County-wide watershed level.

Benchmark: 3 - Sufficient active participation by commercial and non-commercial agricultural operators (farmers and ranchers) over 10 years that achieves the protection of critical area functions and values at a County-wide watershed level

Strategy/Metric Description

Measurable through the number of acres reported in key stewardship practice, number of ISPs and VSP checklists submitted, and sufficient producer participation necessary to meet protection and enhancement benchmarks

Accomplishment

Met protection and enhancement benchmarks for units of forest understory management, habitat management, livestock/range management, pest management, and soil management stewardship practices with over 6,695 acres, 141 structures/facilities, and 34,365 feet managed in WRIAs 55, 57, 59, 61, and 62. These categories provide critical area protection function (based on the crosswalk provided in Table 5-6 in the Work Plan). 16 ISPs and 16 VSP Checklists were submitted. Protection and enhancement benchmarks were met.

Status

Met

Goal: 6 - Promote producer participation in voluntary stewardship of agricultural lands and critical areas to meet the protection and/or enhancement benchmarks and protect critical areas functions and values at a County-wide watershed level.

Benchmark: 4 - Passive participation by commercial and non-commercial agricultural operators in VSP stewardship practices is maintained or increased over 10 years on agricultural land (including but not limited to those listed in Table 5-6 and Appendix D, Attachment 2)

Strategy/Metric Description

Measurable through mapping and aerial photo evaluation and/or rapid watershed assessment of practices in place and random sampling of farmers and ranchers in the field by technical assistance providers with willing landowners

Accomplishment

POCD has mapped 13 sites through GIS for assessment and tracking, cataloging hundreds of acres of weed control, pasture restoration using minimally invasive practices, minimal and no-tillage, cover crop plantings, riparian buffers, thinning/pruning and brush management in forests, wetland enhancements, silvopasture and wildlife habitat improvement, to name a few. Since 2019, POCD staff have worked with 30 landowners to catalog and ground-truth stewardship practices implemented on agricultural lands with a critical area intersect. Of the 288 farmers that qualify for VSP, we conducted site visits with 18 producers. Technical assistance providers met with randomly sampled producers in-the-field to verify the existence and current condition of these projects. From our findings, we observed that most producers were already protecting critical areas with their current practices; we also found that many were interested in implementing more advanced practices to enhance their critical areas but felt limited by funding or other personal resource concerns.

Status

Met

Goal: 6 - Promote producer participation in voluntary stewardship of agricultural lands and critical areas to meet the protection and/or enhancement benchmarks and protect critical areas functions and values at a County-wide watershed level.

Benchmark: 5 - Technical assistance and outreach are provided to agricultural producers to encourage stewardship practices and VSP participation

<u>Strategy/Metric Description</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	<u>Status</u>
Measurable through the number of outreach and education events and the number of event attendees	POCD has held 9 outreach events, along with several additional social media and web campaigns. 780 postcards and letters were mailed through a mailing campaign. POCD reached over 110 community members through events.	Met

Critical Area Monitoring

Monitoring Activity: Landscape Change Detection from 2011 to 2021 to track habitat landcover

Included Critical Area(s):

- Wetlands
- Critical Aquifer Recharge
- Frequently Flooded
- Geologic Hazard
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Input datasets used

Year of map/imagery for comparison with 2011 baseline

Spatial accuracy of least accurate input layer Units for spatial accuracy

Classification accuracy of least accurate input layer

Field verification of overall accuracy: Omission

Field verification of overall accuracy: Commission

Field verification of overall accuracy: Kappa

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Above 0 = N/A.
Out of over 22,000 acres in Pend Oreille county analyzed through GIS change detection tools, there was a loss of about 500 acres of habitat/critical areas (about 2.3%). 2.3% is within the 5% error threshold, and not discussed as a significance loss of cover that would require adaptive management. Benchmarks and stewardship practice tracking present an exceedance of most performance metrics, showing more agricultural lands applying stewardship and conservation practices compared to the baseline.

Adaptive Management needed? Yes No

Included Critical Area(s):

- Wetlands
- Critical Aquifer Recharge
- Frequently Flooded
- Geologic Hazard
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Analyzed minimum and maximum flows, and surrounding months. USGS data is collected year-round at specific gauges along the Pend Oreille River.

Desired accuracy of the monitoring

Number of samples/sites

Observed mean

Observed standard deviation

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

N/A – this data is managed by the USGS.

Is the observation statistically significant? Yes No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? Yes No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

For Gage #12395950 (Pend Oreille River at Newport, WA; WRIA 62), monthly low flows in 2019 are similar to those in 2016. Minimum flows range from 7,000 to 10,000 cfs from late summer to early spring and increase to as high as 30,000 cfs for late spring and early summer flows. For both Water Years 2016 and 2019, October had a higher minimum flow than surrounding months (around 19,500 cfs).

For Gage #12395500 (Pend Oreille River at Cusick, WA; WRIA 62), monthly lake elevations in 2019 are similar to those seen in 2016. High elevations are around 2039 feet and occur in May while low elevations are near 2030.5 feet and occur in September.

Surface water elevation records were available for Gage #12396455 (Pend Oreille River at Lone, WA; WRIA 62). Elevations 2016 and 2020 values were within the same range and exhibited similar trends. Water levels dropped to 2028 feet for one period each year; in 2016, this occurred in March, while in 2020, the drop occurred in June. Outside of these times, water levels were generally kept similar when comparing 2016 and 2020.

For Gage #12398600 (Pend Oreille River at International Boundary; WRIA 62), monthly low flows were generally lower in 2019 compared to 2016. In 2016, only August and September months had significant periods of time when the average daily flow was below 10,000 cfs (sometimes dropping as low as 4,000 cfs). In 2019, the lowest flow was above 5,000 cfs, but there were

more times when flows would drop below 10,000 cfs (November to March in addition to August and September).

For Gage #12396500 (Pend Oreille River below Box Canyon near Lone, WA; WRIA 62), monthly low flows were generally lower in 2019 compared to 2016. In 2016, only August and September months had significant periods of time when the average daily flow was below 9,000 cfs (sometimes dropping as low as 6,000 cfs). In 2019, the lowest flow was above 7,000 cfs, but there were more times when flows would drop below 9,000 cfs (February and March in addition to August and September).

Gage #12395500 (Cusick) has agricultural practices both upstream and downstream of the meter. No significant changes have occurred to the hydrology patterns from the baseline to 2019, suggesting nearby agricultural practices have not resulted in measurable changes in the watershed. Because the Pend Oreille River and surrounding lakes are large systems, it is difficult to analyze direct impacts from agriculture to water quantity.

Flows have not dropped below baseline levels. The flows tracked at the 5 gauges have remained stable over the 5-year reporting period.

Adaptive Management needed? Yes No

Monitoring Activity: Ecology 303(d) water quality tools to assess changes in Category 2 through 5 listings (2018 to 2021)

Included Critical Area(s):

- Wetlands
- Critical Aquifer Recharge
- Frequently Flooded
- Geologic Hazard
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Desired accuracy of the Analysis Observed mean

Number of samples drawn from existing data Observed standard deviation

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

Is the observation statistically significant? Yes No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? Yes No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Adaptive Management needed? Yes No

Monitoring Activity: Groundwater quality data from WA Department of Health – 2011 to 2021 trends

Included Critical Area(s):

- Wetlands
- Critical Aquifer Recharge
- Frequently Flooded
- Geologic Hazard
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Type of data

Timeframe/season for field sampling or data collection (e.g., summer only, annually, monthly)

Desired accuracy of the Analysis Observed mean

Number of samples drawn from existing data Observed standard deviation

What statistical test was performed? (Ex. t-test, ANOVA, time series, regression, etc.)

Is the observation statistically significant? Yes No

Did the underlying data meet statistical test assumptions (e.g., normality)? Yes No

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Adaptive Management needed? Yes No

Monitoring Activity: •WDFW Priority Habitats and Species data and landscape change detection for changes in amount of FHWCA and Wetlands (2011 to 2021)

Included Critical Area(s):

- Wetlands
- Critical Aquifer Recharge
- Frequently Flooded
- Geologic Hazard
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Input datasets used

Year of map/imagery for comparison with 2011 baseline

Spatial accuracy of least accurate input layer Units for spatial accuracy

Classification accuracy of least accurate input layer

Field verification of overall accuracy: Omission

Field verification of overall accuracy: Commission

Field verification of overall accuracy: Kappa

Briefly describe the outcome of the monitoring and why VSP implementation/lack of implementation contributed to the observations

Above 0 = N/A. This data is produced by WDFW and results were summarized in a narrative memo.

No significant changes caused by anthropomorphic factors were detected in any of the critical area/agricultural intersect units analyzed. Less than 0.001% area showed loss of tree canopy in the combined critical area units.

Adaptive Management needed? Yes No