Utah's Watershed Restoration Initiative
Project Prioritization Score Sheet – FY18

Project Name: _____

Region:_____Database Project Number: _____

Total Score (150 Points Possible): _____

NOTE: This score sheet should be used to guide Utah Watershed Restoration Initiative (UWRI) project prioritization decisions, but some interpretation may be necessary. Statewide prioritization/rankings by the UWRI leadership will weigh proposed project costs funded by the project proponent compared to requested partnership funds.

POLICY AND LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Does the project support one of the three legs of Utah's Watershed Restoration Initiative?

Utah's Watershed Restoration Initiative is a partnership-driven effort to conserve, restore and manage ecosystems in priority areas across the state to enhance Utah's

- Wildlife and Biological Diversity
- Water Quality and Yield for all Uses
- Opportunities for Sustainable Uses

YES • NO • If NO, do not Rank or Fund.

If an Archaeology clearance is required, is the clearance complete or does it have a high likelihood that it will be complete before the tentative project starting date?

YES • NO • If NO, do not Rank or Fund.

If NEPA is required, is the clearance complete or does it have a high likelihood that it will be complete before the tentative project starting date?

YES • NO • If NO, do not Rank or Fund.

UWRI CORE-VALUES CONSIDERATIONS

WATER QUALITY AND YIELD FOR ALL USES

Project has the potential to improve water quality and/or increase water quantity. **Maximum points possible for this section - 10**	**0 - 10**

WILDLIFE AND BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

HIGH INTEREST GAME AND FISH

HIG/F Rank: Up to ten additional points will be given if any of the project's benefiting species includes high interest game/sportfish species (any species with a numerical HIG/F ranking in the UWRI database). Points are only awarded once for the highest scoring HIG/F species. For example, if the proposal lists two R4 species and one R5 species, it would receive +7 bonus points for the R4 species. **Maximum points possible for this section - 10**	**HIG/F Rank** **R1 = +10** **R2 = +9** **R3 = +8** **R4 = +7** **R5 = +6**

SPECIES OF GREATEST CONSERVATION NEED

Project will benefit species of greatest conservation need. Up to ten points will be given if any of the project's benefiting species includes species with an N1-N5 National Conservation Status as identified in the 2015 Utah Wildlife Action Plan (https://wildlife.utah.gov/learn-more/wap2015.html). Points are only awarded once – for the single most at risk species listed as a benefiting species in the proposal. For example, if the proposal lists three N1, one N2 and two N3 benefiting species, it only gets 10 bonus points for the N1 species. For conservation status definitions visit this website http://explorer.natureserve.org/nsranks.htm **Maximum points possible for this section - 10**	**N1 = +10** **N2 = +9** **N3 = +8** **N4 = +7** **N5 = +6**

UTAH WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN THREAT ABATEMENT

Project addresses priority Level 3 threat(s) to key habitats and/or species of greatest conservation need as identified in the 2015 Utah Wildlife Action Plan (WAP). Very High, High, and Medium refer to highest level of a threat's impact to any WAP habitats or species. **Maximum points possible for this section - 10**	**VH = +10** **H = +8** **M = +6**

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE USES

FORAGE - INCREASED PRODUCTION OR DISTRIBUTION

Does the project have the potential to improve/increase livestock forage or work to improve livestock distribution, even if livestock aren't currently in the project area? To receive maximum points, livestock at some future time would have to have some access to the project or forage area, including possible future use as a grass bank. **Maximum points possible for this section - 10**	**0 - 10**

ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

THREATS AND RISKS

What are the threats and risks associated with the vegetative community being proposed? Consideration may be given to project location, species impacted, methods, phases, etc. Are there negative impacts associated with conducting the treatment at this time? Is the project area at risk of crossing an ecological or other threshold? Higher scores should be given to projects where waiting could result in crossing a threshold wherein future restoration would become much more difficult, cost prohibitive, or impossible. **Maximum points possible for this section - 10**	**0 - 10**

FIRE - REDUCED CATASTROPHIC RISK, IMPROVED REGIME CONDITION

If applicable, score how the proposed project will significantly reduce the risk of fuel loading and/or continuity of hazardous fuels including the use of fire wise species in re-seeding operations. Consider the value of any features being protected by reducing the risk of fire. Values may include; communities at risk, permanent infrastructure, municipal watersheds, campgrounds, critical wildlife habitat, etc. Consider the size of the area where fuels are being reduced and the distance from the feature(s) at risk. **Maximum points possible for this section - 10**	**0 - 10**

FUTURE MANAGEMENT

Does the project include details on future management that will ensure the long-term success of the project? This may include; post-treatment grazing rest and/or management plan changes, wildlife herd/species management plans, ranch plans, conservation easements or other permanent site protection plans, resource management plans, forest plans, etc. Consideration should be given to the need and opportunity for follow-up treatments, where applicable, as well as adaptive management if project objectives are not being met. **Maximum points possible for this section - 15**	**0 - 15**

CONSERVATION FOCUS AREA

Is the proposed project entirely or partially located within a UWRI conservation focus area? Factors to be considered may include: percent of total project area that falls inside the focus area, importance of the area to the overall health of the watershed, other recently completed projects within the focus area that will spread out wildlife/livestock use. Projects that fall completely outside of a UWRI focus area should receive zero points. Maintenance type projects located within past UWRI funded project areas should receive full points, even if the past UWRI focus area has since been deleted from the current UWRI conservation focus area map. **Maximum points possible for this section - 20**	**0 - 20**

ADMINISTRATIVE OR PARTNERSHIP CONSIDERATIONS

PARTNER INCLUSION

Does the project contain a description of affected partners and how these partners were engaged in the planning, implementation and planned monitoring of the project? Points should not be given for the number of partners, but rather for the completeness and effort to include partners during all levels of the project proposal process.	**0 - 10**
If applicable, does the project cross jurisdictional boundaries? If the proposed project area "touches" other ownerships, was consideration given to expand the project to a broader landscape area? If no opportunity existed, award full points. If an opportunity existed and minimal or no outreach occurred, score accordingly.	**0 - 5**
Maximum points possible for this section - 15	

PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING

Does the outlined monitoring plan included with the project proposal adequately measure/determine if the project's stated objectives are being achieved, both in the short and long term? Does the monitoring plan include a strategy to produce reports that can be uploaded to the UWRI website?	**0 - 15**
Maximum points possible for this section - 15	

RELATION TO MANAGEMENT PLANS

Does the project help to meet specific goals and objectives and/or management opportunities identified in natural resource/species-oriented or publicly scrutinized planning and assessment documents? Projects that claim they meet multiple objectives (UWRI Core Values and Threats and Risks), should naturally include more than one plan and/or multiple objectives from a single plan. Therefore, points will be awarded based on the completeness of tying plans to stated Goals/objectives and not to the number of plans listed. Please be thorough. **Some examples of natural resource oriented plans; species management plans, wildlife management area plans, herd unit management plans, eco-regional assessments/sub-assessments, resource management plans, forest management plans, species recovery plans, watershed/TMDL plans, allotment and/or grazing management plans County or Cooperative Weed Management Plans, fuel/fire management plans, Wildlife Action Plan, etc.	**0 - 10**
Maximum points possible for this section - 10	

WRI PROPOSAL/PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Has the project manager adequately responded to any and all comments in the UWRI database related to this proposal (assuming adequate time was given)?	**+5**
Does the project manager have any outstanding completion reports (pending complete status in database) from previously funded UWRI projects?	**-5**
Maximum points possible for this section - +5 or -5	