

NEVADA CONSERVATION CREDIT SYSTEM

100% HSI DESKTOP SUBMISSION QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

This form is intended for use by the SETT to ensure that 100% HSI Desktop submissions with no fieldwork for proposed debit projects undergo a consistent Quality Assessment (QA) process. This QA process is intended to ensure project footprints, map units, and anthropogenic features provided by certified verifiers are assessed by the SETT following the same process prior to the commitment of significant resources to complete mitigation obligations.

SIGNATURE

The 100% HSI Desktop QA process has been completed and the information provided in this form is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Credit System Administrator Name

Credit System Project Lead

Date of Completion

QA SUBMISSION STATUS

Please mark the applicable QA submission status below.

_____ **Debits calculated @ 100% HSI (Term/Perm)**
 _____ **Version**
 _____ **Acres Direct/Indirect**

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name _____ Term Length _____
 County _____ State _____
 WAFWA Zone: _____ Biologically Significant Unit: _____ Population Management Unit: _____

PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

Project Proponent Name _____

VERIFIER INFORMATION

Verifier Name _____

QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

1. Confirm that the following forms have been received.

INITIAL WHEN COMPLETE:

Verifier Conflict of Interest Form: _____

Debit Project Review Form with Signed
Waiver and Other Requested Information
Attached: _____

Debit System Calculator: _____

A geodatabase with GIS shapefiles
identified by the appropriate naming
conventions for the applicable project
area, analysis area boundaries, habitat
categories, map units, and final transect
numbers: _____

1. Confirm that the Proposed_Surface_Disturbance direct areas are delineated as expected and that map units make up all sage grouse management category habitat in these areas. Confirm proposed disturbance footprints are classified correctly (i.e. Term_Reclaimed, Term_Retired, Term_Reclassified, Permanent) and do not contain private land. Assess whether the project footprint and map units are the same as previously received information, if applicable. If changes have been made, please note why.

INITIAL WHEN COMPLETE:

Completion status: _____

Date completed: _____

Notes: _____

Action items: _____

Description: _____

Status: _____

2. Confirm that all potential meadows, including stringer meadows, springs and seeps, are characterized as meadow and delineated as accurately as possible within the project area. Further assessment in the field will assess the accuracy of the meadow characterization and the delineation, prior to sampling.

INITIAL WHEN COMPLETE:

Completion status: _____

Date completed: _____

Notes: _____

Action items: _____

Description: _____

Status: _____

3. Confirm anthropogenic features are delineated and categorized correctly. Review all squares in project area, including indirect and analysis area, for non-delineated features.

SUPER IMPORTANT – check for any overlaps and make sure they are labeled correctly. That is why it is always necessary to start from scratch on creating the current anthro layer from the base layers, so that the overlaps can be pulled out. What people are doing is adding new anthro features to their Current_Anthro_Features_Project, forgetting about overlaps, and then having major problems. Also check to ensure ALL columns in the layer are filled out and accurate (Removed, Returned, Subtype as Modified).

INITIAL WHEN COMPLETE:

Date completed: _____

Notes: _____

4. Confirm the presence or absence of any existing debit or credit projects in the analysis area of the project. Make note and work with the corresponding SETT Lead on any impacts due to presence.

INITIAL WHEN COMPLETE:

Completion status: _____

Date completed: _____

Notes: _____

Action items: _____

Description: _____

Status: _____

5. Assess the aerial imagery, ESDs, DRGs, previous fires, slopes, aspects, and other terrain characteristics to understand map unit delineations and decisions to split or lump specific areas. Are heterogeneous meadow map units split? Are areas with significantly more sagebrush cover lumped with cheat grass dominated areas? Please make descriptive notes on delineations and any issues from your perspective. Confirm all map units are divided by WAFWA zone at minimum. No map unit should exist in two different WAFWA zones.

INITIAL WHEN COMPLETE:

Completion status: _____

Date completed: _____

Notes: _____

Action items: _____

Description: _____

Status: _____

ISSUE TRACKING AND COMMENTS

List and describe any comments, issues or problems encountered during the Quality Assessment process and changes made from the original submission to ensure a complete and acceptable Desktop submission.

ISSUE DESCRIPTION	ISSUE STATUS/RESOLUTION