



UTAH'S
WATERSHED
RESTORATION
INITIATIVE

WATERSHED.UTAH.GOV

Project Prioritization Score Sheet – Fiscal Year 2022

Project Name: _____

Region: _____ Database Project Number: _____

Total Score (175 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. For more information on past project submissions, samples of previously funded projects, other important WRI documents and for upcoming regional meeting dates and times go to watershed.utah.gov

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

- Watershed Health 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 will it be completed before the tentative project starting date?

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

If NEPA is required, is the clearance complete or will it be completed 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

WATER QUALITY

Does the project have the potential to improve or protect water quality? Benefits to water quality would include reducing the risk of severe wildfire, reductions in pollutants, nutrient loading and or sediment loading. Higher scores should be given to projects within watersheds that supply drinking water to communities or include drinking water facilities. Watersheds immediately adjacent to perennial water bodies and riparian systems, exceeding TMDLs, or identified as impaired should also be awarded more points. Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 – 10
---	---------------

WATER QUANTITY

Does the project have the potential to increase water quantity? Possible considerations may include: projects that show direct benefits to instream flows, expansion of hydric vegetation, are likely to turn intermittent channels to perennial, and /or increases in natural hydrologic storage capacity; changing grazing management, changes to the vegetation class, brush and/or weed management, soil modifications that can directly affect the water regime, etc. Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 – 10
--	---------------

WATERSHED HEALTH AND BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

WATERSHED HEALTH

Consider the projects overall impact on the watershed's health and resilience. Higher points should be awarded to projects that include more than one ecological community and/or projects that are located in an ecological type that contributes greater value to overall watershed health such as riparian, stream, wet meadow or wetland sites. Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 - 10
---	---------------

THREAT ABATEMENT - SPECIES

Project addresses priority Level 3 threat(s) to key species of greatest conservation need as identified in the 2015 Utah Wildlife Action Plan (WAP) and/or Level 3 threat(s) to high interest game and fish species (HIG/F). Very High, High, and Medium refer to highest level of a threat's impact to any WAP or HIG/F species. For a complete list of WAP threats by species and habitats please visit our website at watershed.utah.gov Maximum points possible for this section - 10	VH = +10 H = +8 M = +6
---	---

THREAT ABATEMENT - HABITAT

Project addresses priority Level 3 threat(s) to key habitats 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. Maximum points possible for this section - 10	VH = +10 H = +8 M = +6
--	---

HIGH INTEREST GAME AND FISH

<p>HIG/F Rank: Up to five 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 2 points for the R4 species.</p> <p>Project Quality/Need/Benefit: Assess the project's quality and need relative to the suite of high interest game and fish species selected. This section is designed to elevate projects that may have a higher benefit to the selected species. Higher points should be awarded to projects that take place in areas of greater need, have a larger impact on threats associated with species and to projects with a more complete list of species that may benefit from the project.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section – 10</p>	<p>R1 = +5 R2 = +4 R3 = +3 R4 = +2 R5 = +1</p> <p>0 - 5</p>
---	---

SPECIES OF GREATEST CONSERVATION NEED

<p>SGCN Rank: Project will benefit species of greatest conservation need. Up to five 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. 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 5 points for the N1 species. For conservation status definitions visit the NatureServe website at: http://explorer.natureserve.org</p> <p>Project Quality/Need/Benefit: Assess the project's quality and need relative to the suite of species of greatest conservation need selected. This section is designed to elevate projects that may have a higher benefit to the selected species. Higher points should be awarded to projects that take place in areas of greater need, have a larger impact on threats associated with species and to projects with a more complete list of species that may benefit from the project.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 10</p>	<p>N1 = +5 N2 = +4 N3 = +3 N4 = +2 N5 = +1</p> <p>0 - 5</p>
--	---

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE USES

FORAGE PRODUCTION OR IMPROVED DISTRIBUTION

<p>Does the project have the potential to improve/increase forage or 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 area, including possible future use as a grass bank.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 10</p>	<p>0 - 10</p>
---	----------------------

OTHER SUSTAINABLE USES OF NATURAL RESOURCES

<p>Does the project have the potential to provide other sustainable uses of natural resources besides livestock grazing? Examples may include sustainable timber harvest, biomass utilization, recreation, etc.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 10</p>	<p>0 - 10</p>
---	----------------------

OTHER ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

ECOLOGICAL THRESHOLD – THREATS AND RISKS

<p>Is the project area at risk of crossing an ecological or other threshold? Higher scores should be given to projects where waiting to implement could result in crossing a threshold wherein future restoration would become much more difficult, cost prohibitive, or even impossible.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 15</p>	0 - 15
---	---------------

FIRE - REDUCED CATASTROPHIC RISK, IMPROVED REGIME CONDITION

<p>If applicable, score how the proposed project will reduce the risk of large unwanted wildfire, decrease fuel loading, remove hazardous fuels, such as invasive species and forested areas impacted by insect and disease, and promote landscape resilience. Consider the value of any features being protected by reducing the risk of fire. Values-at-risk may include; communities, permanent infrastructure, municipal watersheds, critical wildlife habitat, etc. Consider the scale of the project and how effectively it will reduce wildfire risk; also consider the distance of the project from values-at-risk. Higher points should be awarded to projects designed to protect human health and safety.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 10</p>	0 - 10
--	---------------

FUTURE MANAGEMENT

<p>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. If seeding is included as part of the treatment plan, full points should only be awarded if a grazing rest agreement will be signed by all applicable parties prior to project initiation.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 15</p>	0 - 15
--	---------------

CONSERVATION FOCUS AREA

<p>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 completed projects within the focus area that can help distribute wildlife and/or livestock. 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 conservation focus area map.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 10</p>	0 - 10
--	---------------

ADMINISTRATIVE & PARTNERSHIP CONSIDERATIONS

PARTNER INCLUSION

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

PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING

<p>Does the monitoring plan adequately measure/determine if the project's objectives are being achieved, both in the short and long term? Does the monitoring plan include a strategy/commitment to produce reports/photos to be uploaded to the UWRI website?</p>	0 - 10
Maximum points possible for this section - 10	

RELATION TO MANAGEMENT PLANS

<p>Does the project help to meet specific goals and objectives and/or management opportunities identified in natural resource/species-oriented and/or publicly scrutinized planning and assessment documents? Projects that claim they meet multiple objectives should naturally include more than one plan and/or multiple objectives from a single plan. Points will be awarded based on the completeness of tying management plans to stated goals/objectives and not to the total number of plans listed. Please be thorough.</p> <p>**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, community wildfire preparedness plans, species recovery plans, watershed/TMDL plans, allotment and/or grazing management plans, state or county resource management plans, cooperative weed management plans, fuel/fire management plans, wildlife action plan, etc.</p>	0 - 10
Maximum points possible for this section - 10	

WRI PROPOSAL/PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

<p>Has the project manager failed to adequately respond to any and all comments in the UWRI database related to this proposal (assuming adequate time was given)?</p>	0 to -5
<p>Does the project manager have any outstanding completion reports (pending complete status in database) from previously funded UWRI projects?</p>	-5
<p>Did the project manager submit any completion reports from the last WRI funding cycle after the deadline of August 31st?</p>	-5
Maximum points possible for this section – 0 to -15	