

Recovery Potential Metrics **Summary Form**

Indicator Name: GOVERNMENT AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Type: Social Context

Rationale/Relevance to Recovery Potential: Government agency support in the form of funding, recognition, added expertise, regulatory backing, or an organizing/facilitating influence is cited as having a favorable effect on community and stakeholder buy-in on restoration efforts.

How Measured: If the screening of this indicator is being done by an agency, that in itself implies agency involvement for all waters screened; therefore, this metric should reflect some form of additional or other-agency involvement outside the program that is assessing recovery potential. Examples of agency involvement often perceived as a positive effect by other stakeholders include watershed or restoration planning, research projects that may inform actions that can improve condition, recognition programs (e.g., wild, scenic and recreational rivers), and agency conservation funding incentives. Scoring this metric can be most simply done as 1/0 for presence/absence. Other scoring alternatives include numeric counts of total agencies/programs involved, or weighting specific agency connections that appear to be particularly important.

Data Source: Generally obtained from ancillary information about specific waters and watersheds, but some limited mapped information may document occurrence of different agencies' projects and actions on specific waters.

Indicator Status (check one or more)

- Developmental concept.
 Plausible relationship to recovery.
 Single documentation in literature or practice.
 Multiple documentation in literature or practice.
 Quantification.

Comments: Operational. Chances exist for uneven or incomplete data across all waters of concern, but this metric can represent a powerful influence where the agency involvement is in high demand and well-funded.

Examples from Supporting Literature (abbrev. citations and points made):

- (Leach and Pelkey 2001) themes relating to watershed partnership success include [note that **bolded ones** are spatially representable for recovery screening with existing data while others are usually not available as spatially explicit data]: **funding, broad and inclusive membership**, committed participants, **effective leadership**, bottom-up leadership vs balanced among levels, trust, low or moderate conflict (vs none), geographic scope, limited scope of activities, adequate time, well-defined process rules, consensus rules, **formal enforcement mechanisms, effective communication, adequate sci-tech info**, monitoring data on outcomes, training in collaboration, **agency support and participation, legislative encouragement, community resources.**