

FEASIBILITY RANKING		STRATEGY: [CODE][STRATEGIC HEADING]			COMPLETED BY: [NAME]		
OBJECTIVE	EFFICACY <sup>1</sup> 4=Certain 3=Likely 2=Somewhat. 1=Unlikely	RESOURCES <sup>2</sup> 4=<\$50,000 3=\$50,000- 2=\$250,000- 1=>\$1,250,000	ORGANIZATION <sup>3</sup> 4=Very Functional 3=Functional 2=Somewhat 1=Non-functional	EXPERTISE <sup>4</sup> 4=Highly 3=Accessible 2=Somewhat 1=Inaccessible	MOTIVATION <sup>5</sup> 4=Support >> 3=Support >= 2=Support <= 1=Support <<	INFORMATION <sup>6</sup> 4=Well Documented 3=Somewhat 2=Weakly 1=Undocumented	Summary Rank
[code][Restore/Maintain Natural Flow Regimes]	3	4	4	3	3	4	3.06

<sup>1</sup> Expected success of the proposed action in abating the targeted risk or improving wildlife health  
<sup>2</sup> Estimated cost of implementing actions to achieve the objective  
<sup>3</sup> Experience and efficiency of existing or developing organizational structures poised to implement the action  
<sup>4</sup> Availability of skills and knowledge necessary to see implementation through  
<sup>5</sup> Anticipated level of buy-in of all involved public and private interests  
<sup>6</sup> Quality or reliability of the evidence, experience, or factual knowledge supporting the scores provided  
<sup>7</sup> Summary rank= ((a+b/2)/4)((c+d+e+f)/4), where a=efficacy score, b=resources score, c=organization score, d=expertise score, e=motivation, f=information