

Utah's Watershed Restoration Initiative - Water Development Project Prioritization Score Sheet – FY20 (7/1/2019-6/30/2020)

Project Name: _____

Region: _____ Database Project Number: _____

Total Score (100 Points Possible): _____

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 of Natural Resources

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.

Have the required water rights been secured and have the water right numbers been listed in the proposal? Has coordination with the appropriate state and federal management agencies been completed?

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

Will the project benefit public resources such as wildlife, water quality/quantity, watershed health, etc.?

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

Does the project fulfill the match requirement of 25% match on private lands and/or 10% match on state and federal lands? Match can be a combination of in-kind and landowner/permittee/partner funding.

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

ENHANCEMENT OF GRAZING MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

To what degree does the project enhance grazing management principles (e.g. livestock distribution, time, timing and intensity of grazing?) Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 - 10
---	---------------

SUPPLEMENTAL WATER HAULING

To what degree does the project reduce or remove the need for supplemental water hauling by permittees who are currently hauling water to make use of their allotments. Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 - 10
---	---------------

ALLOTMENT USE

To what degree does the project open up previously unused portions of allotments that are currently not in use due to lack of available water. Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 - 10
--	---------------

SENSITIVE AREA RELIEF

To what degree does the projects improve livestock distribution/timing to alleviate pressure on sensitive areas such as riparian resources, culturally sensitive areas or other important habitats Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 - 10
--	---------------

FUTURE MANAGEMENT – MAINTENANCE PLANS

Does the project include details on future management and maintenance needs and responsibilities? Does the proposal include a plan to adequately address these needs in the future? Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 - 10
---	---------------

HIGH INTEREST GAME AND FISH

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.	R1 = +5 R2 = +4 R3 = +3 R4 = +2 R5 = +1
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. Maximum points possible for this section - 10	0 - 5

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 (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 5 points for the N1 species. For conservation status definitions visit this website http://explorer.natureserve.org/nsranks.htm</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>
---	---

FIRE - REDUCED CATASTROPHIC RISK, IMPROVED REGIME CONDITION

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

PARTNER INCLUSION

<p>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 <u>not</u> 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.</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 10</p>	<p>0 - 10</p>
---	----------------------

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> <p>Maximum points possible for this section - 10</p>	<p>0 - 10</p>
---	----------------------

WRI PROPOSAL/PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

<p>Does the project manager have any outstanding completion reports (pending complete status in database) from previously funded UWRI projects?</p> <p>Maximum points possible for this section – 5</p>	<p>-5</p>
--	------------------