

Tally Total	TAC vote on metric characteristics 11/28/12					Additional details and guidance to completed metric information	METRIC CHARACTERISTIC
						Name by which metric will be referred to by ITAS	Metric Name
	TAC Vote and Ranking					Narrative general description of metric expanding upon name	Description
					MANAGEMENT NEEDS		
0						Action tracking: tracking of implementation action(s) completed Performance measure: tracking of effectiveness of implementation actions completed Indicator: tracking of system response as result of cumulative actions implemented over time	What type of tracking metric is it?
1			1			Name the actions that would influence the change in the value of the metric in the desired direction over time.	What management action(s) do you expect to influence metric over time?
7	3		4			How would be future targets established and how are they related to TMDL objectives?	How could metric value over time be used to measure progress toward TMDL objectives? OR If targets already exist, what are they and how are they linked to TMDL?
6		1	4		1	Is there an opportunity to use the spatial tracking of changes in metric value to identify priority locations for future sequential rounds of implementation?	How could metric value change be used to inform locations and/or types management action priorities over time?
2		1	1			Immediate: typical of action tracking metric Short term: within 3 yrs Long term: greater than 3 yrs	What is the expected response time to effective management action(s)?
2			1		1	What drivers of the system are the management actions expected to change that would directly reduce sediment loading, sediment distribution, instream flows and other critical stream characteristics identified in the TMDL?	Explain the cause and effect linkages between these management actions and the desired TMDL objectives?
3	1	1			1	Explain what role the metric value may play in an experimental design to test the cause and effect linkage explained in Column J over time.	How can the metric be used to test these cause and effect linkages between management actions and achieving TMDL objectives?
7	2		4	1		H, M, L. Relative signal to noise ratio of metric value over time to each.	Sensitivity of metric to 1. management actions 2. natural variability 3. sampling error
TECHNICAL NEEDS							
0						Specific units by which metric will be expressed in ITAS.	Unit of measure in ITAS
0						What data is needed to quantify metric and general insight as to how data is generated?	Data sources needed
6		1		4	1	What entity collected, manages, maintains data? Does data reporting need to be sensitive to ownership or locations?	Data ownership
2			2			What is the spatial data collection design? General locations within Napa Watershed, estimated number of sites and general rationale for this spatial sampling approach.	Spatial data collection needs
0						General approach to how the data obtained is integrated to represent watershed or subwatershed wide metric conditions over time.	How are a series of spatially explicit measurements integrated to calculate/express this ITAS metric?
3	1	2				H, M, L for each H: protocols exist, monitoring program in place, analysis and reporting protocols established. L: none of the above locally at this time	Data availability for 1. past > 2yrs ago 2. recent (+/- 2 yrs) 3. future < 2yrs ahead
5		1	2		2	H, M, L for each H: Complex and requires technical expertise, typically researcher or consultant. L: A wide array of stakeholders could complete tasks with some minimum level of training.	Technical expertise needed to 1. Collect data 2. Manage/analyze/report data as metric
8	3		3	2		Provide estimates to nearest \$10k and best judgment given existing knowledge.	Costs 1. Startup costs to establish sites, define data collection, data management/analysis reporting protocols to integrate into Napa ITAS from 2012 (i.e., cost would be lower if the protocols/programs already exist) 2. Annual costs to collect, manage, analyze, report in Napa ITAS
1			1			Perceived feasibility given the integration given all of the information/considerations above.	Feasibility of metric incorporation into ITAS 1. Immediate 2. Near term (< 2 yrs) 3. Long term (< 5 yrs)
2		1		1		H, M, L and include which monitoring requirements that could be synergistic. Any other monitoring/reporting requirements	Synergy with other monitoring, tracking and reporting requirements
2			1	1		Why do you believe this metric would be a powerful communication tool?	Advantage to communicate progress to regulators, funders, local technical stakeholders, public
2				2		Where do see the limitations of this metric as a communication tool?	Disadvantages to communicate progress to regulators, funders, local technical stakeholders 4. public
0							Primary rationale/justification for why this metric is recommended?
0							Primary limitations/concerns with using this metric?
1			1			Accuracy vs. Cost and Time	Accuracy vs. Cost and Time
1			1			How current/scientifically sound are the methods?	How current/scientifically sound are the methods?
1			1			Can you model the data?	Can you model the data?
1			1			metric value overtime to measure watershed health	metric value overtime to measure watershed health
	10	8	28	11	6		

Means to improve progress tracking
Identify high priority subwatershed
Set targets for these high priority subwatersheds
Target management actions in these subwatersheds