

WATER PROJECT
GRANTS AND
LOANS
&
IRRIGATION
MODERNIZATION
FUNDING

SCORING
CRITERIA

OREGON



WATER RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT



New center pivot in Wallowa County



Piping in Deschutes County



Instream water transfer in Klamath County

[This page is intentionally blank]

Scoring Criteria

Water Project Grants and Loans and Irrigation Modernization Funding

Document Purpose

The scoring criteria for applications to the Water Projects Grants and Loans and Irrigation Modernization funding opportunities are based solely on the public benefits a project is likely to achieve. This document provides an overview of each of the public benefits, describes how the Technical Review Team (TRT) will score the public benefits, and provides recommendations for what information an application should include.

Overview of Application Scoring

Projects funded are those which are likely to achieve the greatest public benefits. The change in conditions anticipated to result in public benefits must be described and explained in the project application. When evaluating an application, the TRT examines public benefits in three categories: economic, environmental, and social/cultural. To be funded, projects must achieve a minimum score of seven in each category. As discussed below, this is a competitive funding opportunity where projects are ranked according to public benefits, therefore achieving a minimum score does not guarantee funding.

When applicants describe the project’s public benefits in their application, they should include a description of the conditions prior to and following project implementation, and clearly demonstrate the extent to which the project is expected to result in a change in conditions that will provide a public benefit. When possible, applicants should quantify the project’s public benefits. The TRT will only consider public benefits derived from the tasks and project scope contained within the application and the likelihood of achieving those benefits. Public benefits related to future phases (beyond the scope of the proposed project) or unrelated activities will not be scored and should not be included in the application. Likewise public benefits related to past activities will not be considered.

Each category contains six specific public benefits for a total of 18 possible public benefits. The project must provide some benefit in each of the three categories in order to be eligible for funding. Each of the three public benefit categories is given equal importance in the evaluation. Projects do not need to score in all six benefits within a category but must provide benefit in each of the three categories.

| Public Benefit Categories | | |
|---|---------------|-----------------|
| Economic | Environmental | Social/Cultural |
| Minimum Score Required to Receive Funding | | |
| 7 | 7 | 7 |

Overview of Application Review Process

After receiving an application, the Oregon Water Resources Department reviews the application to ensure it is complete. Complete applications are posted online for a 60-day public comment period. Next, the TRT, a panel of inter-agency representatives, evaluates the applications based on the economic, environmental and social/cultural public benefits the project would achieve, and reviews the public comments. The TRT develops a project ranking and funding recommendation. An opportunity for public comment on the funding recommendation will be provided either through a public comment period and/or be accepted at the Water Resources Commission meeting before funding decisions. The Department presents the ranking, public comments, and funding recommendation to the Water Resources Commission for a funding decision.

When making a funding decision, the Water Resources Commission (Commission) considers: 1) the public benefits as evaluated by the TRT; 2) public comments received on the TRT ranking; and 3) funding projects of diverse sizes, types and geographic locations.

Contact

If you have any questions, please contact us at OWRD.Grants@water.oregon.gov or at 971-301-0718.

Scale Used in Evaluation of Public Benefits

Each of the public benefits will be scored according to the scale described below.

Exceptional public benefit: 12 points (pts)

- The project is likely to achieve benefits of an exceptionally high standard or quality.
- The outcomes are very significant, measurable, and represent a key or critical advancement.
- The application includes supporting information and evidence describing the anticipated change in conditions as a result of the project.
- The application includes all necessary information to document a high likelihood of success to achieve the public benefit.

High public benefit: 6 points

- The project is likely to achieve public benefits meeting a high standard of quality.
- The outcomes are significant or represent an important advancement.
- The application includes supporting information and evidence describing the anticipated change in conditions as a result of the project.
- The application includes sufficient information to achieve the anticipated public benefit.

Medium public benefit: 3 points

- The project is likely to achieve moderate public benefit.
- The outcomes are likely to achieve an improvement in conditions.
- The application includes supporting information and evidence describing the anticipated change in conditions as a result of the project.

Minor public benefit: 1 point

- The project may achieve minor public benefits.
- The claims of public benefits are unsupported or unquantified.

No benefit: 0 points

- The project is not likely to achieve a public benefit.
- No positive or negative impact related to the public benefit. No change.

Minor negative impact or detriment: -1 point

- The project may have a minor negative effect or impact to this category.

Medium negative impact or detriment: -3 points

- The project is likely to cause moderate harm and have a negative impact to this category.

Category 1. Economic benefits

The evaluation of economic benefits of a project is based on the change in economic conditions expected to result from the project as demonstrated in the application.

1a. Does the project create or retain jobs?

Job creation means the project would result in new jobs. Retention means the project would prevent the loss of jobs. Job creation and retention benefits may include direct effects within the organization that owns or operates the project, or it may include indirect effects on retail customers or consumers of the project. Temporary jobs resulting from the project will not receive as high of a score as permanent jobs.

Application tip: Quantify the number and identify the type of jobs to be created or retained as a result of the project. Describe the value of the increase or retention of jobs to the local economy.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> increases in the creation or retention of permanent jobs which provide key or critical benefit in the geographic area or employment sector |
| High: 6 pts | Increases in the creation or retention of permanent jobs which provide an important benefit in the geographic area or employment sector |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> increase in the creation or retention of permanent jobs, or seasonal jobs important to the geographic area or employment sector |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> increase in jobs, temporary jobs, or job retention, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | The project is not likely to achieve new jobs or impact job retention |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential for <i>minor job losses</i> |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> job losses or a decrease in jobs is likely |

1b. Does the project increase economic activity?

Economic activity is associated with the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services. Such economic activity could occur within one or more entities/businesses and includes an increase in production, gross sales, or net revenue compared to the year preceding project completion. It also includes but is not limited to the arrival of new firms, renewed contracts, and increased orders.

Application tip: Include information citing economic development plans or other economic activity which would be made possible or supported by the proposed project. If the proposed project protects or maintains current economic activity, demonstrate the degree to which economic activity would decline if the proposed project were not completed and why.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional (five or more years)</i> increase in long-term economic activity of vital, or key importance are likely to occur |
| High: 6 pts | Increases in long-term economic activity with the potential to support future activity important to the area/sector |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate (one to four years)</i> increase in economic activity |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor, short-term (less than one year)</i> increase in economic activity, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Increased economic activity <i>not likely</i> to occur |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential for <i>minor losses or decreases</i> in economic activity |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate losses or decreases</i> in economic activity are likely |

1c. Does the project result in increases in efficiency or innovation?

Increase in efficiency means the project would make improvements in performance or functionality resulting in less effort or waste. Increase in innovation means that new, creative solutions and ideas would be implemented. Examples of increases in efficiency and innovation include water system efficiencies such as system redundancy (back-up, inter-ties), eliminating leakage, innovative production techniques, energy savings (e.g., the energy required to move, treat, or heat water), and time savings.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> increase in efficiency and innovation |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High</i> Increases in efficiency or innovation |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> increases in performance |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> increases <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Increased efficiency or innovation not likely |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential for <i>minor decreases</i> in efficiency or innovation |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate decreases</i> in efficiency or innovation are likely |

1d. Does the project result in enhancement of infrastructure, farmland, public resource lands, industrial lands, commercial lands or lands having other key uses?

Enhancement of infrastructure, including municipal infrastructure, farmland, public resource lands, industrial lands, commercial lands and other lands means that the value, effectiveness, or reliability of such infrastructure or lands would increase as a result of project implementation. This includes an increase in the re-sale or rental value of the land or improvements, including: maintained, repaired, or upgraded infrastructure; maintained or buffered riparian areas; and maintained or improved soils.

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> enhancements of infrastructure or land |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High</i> quality of enhancements to infrastructure or land |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> enhancements |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> enhancements, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Enhancements <i>not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential that infrastructure or lands will be <i>degraded or removed</i> from productive uses (minor negative change) |
| Medium detriment:-3 pts | Infrastructure or lands that are <i>degraded or removed</i> from productive uses (moderate negative change) |

1e. Does the project result in enhancement of the economic value associated with: tourism, recreation, fishing (recreational or commercial), fisheries involving native fish of cultural significance to Indian tribes, or other economic values resulting from restoring or protecting water instream?

Examples of enhancement of these economic values include increases in: daily park fees, tour guide revenues, boat or gear rentals, fishing licenses, or hospitality and lodging.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> increased value of tourism, recreation, fishing, fisheries involving native fish of cultural significance to Indian tribes, or other economic values resulting from restoring or protecting water instream are likely |
| High: 6 pts | A <i>high</i> quality of increased value is likely |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> increased value |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> increased value, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Enhanced values <i>not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential for <i>minor decreases</i> in the economic value of tourism, recreation, fishing, fisheries involving native fish of cultural significance to Indian tribes, or other economic values resulting from restoring or protecting water instream |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate decreases</i> in the economic value of tourism, recreation, fishing, fisheries involving native fish of cultural significance to Indian tribes, or other economic values resulting from restoring or protecting water instream |

1f. Does the project result in increases in irrigated land for agriculture? (which may include increasing irrigated acres, agricultural economic value, or productivity of irrigated land)

Increases in irrigated land for agriculture mean that the numbers of acres (acreage) to be irrigated after project completion would be greater than what could previously be irrigated, or that the agricultural economic value or productivity of current irrigated land would increase. Acreage can include lands that were never historically in production or lands that were historically in production but were taken out of production as a result of insufficient water supply.

Application tip: Highlight the amount of land currently in production in the area, identify the quantity of additional acreage to be irrigated, and calculate the percentage increase in irrigated acreage that would result from the project. Cite scientific articles, reports, or studies and estimate the percentage increase in irrigated crop's economic value or productivity.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional increase</i> in irrigated acreage, or agricultural economic value or productivity |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High</i> increase in irrigated acreage, or agricultural economic value or productivity |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> increase in irrigated acreage or agricultural economic value or productivity |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> increase, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Increased irrigated land or increased value or productivity <i>not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential for <i>minor decreases</i> in agricultural economic value or productivity or irrigated land for agriculture |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate decreases</i> irrigated land for agriculture or agricultural economic value or productivity are likely |

Category 2. Environmental benefits

The evaluation of the environmental benefits of a project is based on the change in environmental conditions expected to result from the project as demonstrated in the application.

2a. Does the project result in measurable improvements in protected streamflows?

Protected streamflow means water that remains in or is released into the natural channel and is legally protected by the State in order to achieve one or more of the following:

- (A) Supports the natural hydrograph;
- (B) Improves floodplain function;
- (C) Supports state- or federally-listed sensitive, threatened or endangered fish species;
- (D) Supports native fish species of cultural importance to Indian tribes; **or**
- (E) Supports riparian habitat important for wildlife.

Application tip: To score in this category an application **must** describe the legal means by which water would be protected by the State, as well as the quality, timing, duration, or other value this streamflow would contribute. The application must also describe how the legally protected water will achieve (A) through (E) listed above (e.g., how water transferred instream through the Allocation of Conserved Water will support, enhance, or improve riparian habitat for wildlife and the extent to which that water will achieve that benefit).

Identifying which water rights will be protected instream will provide clarifying information for the evaluation.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | Project water (or equivalent volume) is legally protected instream by the State and streamflow supports <i>exceptional</i> achievement in each criteria (A) through (E) |
| High: 6 pts | Project water (or equivalent volume) is legally protected instream by the State and streamflow supports achievements of a <i>high quality</i> in a combination of criteria (A) through (E) |
| Medium: 3 pts | Project water (or equivalent volume) is legally protected instream by the State and streamflow supports <i>moderate</i> achievement in a combination of (A) through (E) |
| Minor: 1 pt | Project water (or equivalent volume) is legally protected instream by the State and streamflow supports <i>minor</i> achievement in a combination of (A) through (E), OR benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Improvements in protected streamflow <i>unlikely, OR streamflow would not be legally protected by the State</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential <i>minor decreases</i> to protected streamflow |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate decreases</i> protected streamflow (e.g., proposes to reverse an instream lease) |

2b. Does the project result in water conservation?

Water conservation is reducing water use to achieve the same outcomes by modifying the technology or method of diverting, transporting, applying, or recovering water.

Application tip: Identify the quantity of water reduction, by comparing what water would be needed to accomplish the task after project completion with what was previously used to achieve the same task.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>40 percent or more reduction in water use to achieve the same outcomes</i> |
| High: 6 pts | <i>21-40 percent reduction in water use to achieve the same outcomes</i> |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>11-20 percent reduction</i> |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor (<10 percent) reduction, OR claims are unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | <i>Water conservation not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | <i>Potential for additional water used to achieve the same outcomes (e.g., sacrificing water efficiency for energy/pumping efficiency)</i> |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Additional water used to achieve the same outcomes (e.g., sacrificing water efficiency for energy/pumping efficiency)</i> |

2c. Does the project result in measurable improvement in groundwater levels that enhance environmental conditions in groundwater restricted areas or other areas?

Measurable improvement in groundwater levels mean that groundwater declines would be reduced or eliminated and/or groundwater levels would increase. Stabilization or improvement in groundwater levels could come from aquifer storage and recovery, artificial recharge projects, natural recharge, or discontinued / reduced groundwater use.

Application tip: *Cite and use quantitative measurements to indicate current levels, and method and frequency that improvements would be measured. If applicable, indicate if these improvements would occur in a groundwater restricted area.*

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional improvement in groundwater levels</i> |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High quality of improvement</i> |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate improvement</i> |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor improvement to groundwater levels, OR benefit claims are unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | <i>Improved groundwater levels not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | <i>Potential for minor groundwater declines</i> |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate groundwater declines are likely</i> |

2d. Does the project result in measurable improvement in the quality of surface water or groundwater?

Water quality parameters include but are not limited to: temperature, dissolved oxygen, contaminated sediments, toxic substances, bacteria, or nutrients. Improvements could result from a higher quality of water discharged to surface water or injected into groundwater, from increased flow, from treatment or filtration of water already in the environment, or removal of a known contaminant.

Application tip: *Any improvement must be measurable or quantifiable. One must be able to measure or determine the change in quality before and after project implementation. Cite and use currently available baseline water quality data. Include a water quality monitoring proposal for the post project completion period.*

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional, measurable improvement in water quality</i> |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High quality of measurable improvement</i> |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate, measurable improvement</i> |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor improvement, OR benefit claims are unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | <i>Improved water quality not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | <i>Potential minor negative impacts to water quality</i> |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate negative impacts to water quality are likely</i> |

2e. Does the project increase ecosystem resiliency to climate change impacts?

Ecosystem resiliency to climate change means increasing the ecosystems ability to adapt to changes in climate or positively respond to the impacts of climate change. This includes: increasing streamflow during critical months, increasing natural storage (e.g., wetlands, upland meadows), decreasing water temperature during critical months, protecting or enhancing cold-water habitat, restoring floodplain connectivity and backwater habitats, restoring stream buffers, decreasing coastal erosion and inundation, or decreasing risk of drought, fire occurrence (not fire response), plant disease, or invasive species outbreak. This public benefit is centered on ecosystem resilience, not community resilience. Improvements to a community’s resilience to climate change should be addressed in the social/cultural benefit category.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> improvements in multiple areas in ecosystem resiliency to climate change |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High</i> quality improvements in ecosystem resiliency to climate change |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> improvements |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> improvements, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Improvements in ecosystem resiliency to climate change <i>not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | <i>Minor decreases</i> in ecosystem resiliency to climate change may occur |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Moderate decreases</i> in ecosystem resiliency to climate change are expected |

2f. Does the project result in improvements that address one or more limiting ecological factors in the project watershed?

A limiting ecological factor is an environmental condition that limits the growth, abundance, or distribution of an organism or a population of organisms in the project watershed. Cite the limiting ecological factor(s) in your application and how the project may result in improvements.

Examples of limiting factors may include, but are not limited to, barriers to fish passage, lack of high quality habitat for sensitive, threatened and endangered species, low water quality, or low streamflow.

Application tip: *To score in this category an application must include citation of public reports, peer reviewed scientific studies, or other substantiating documentation from a state or federal agency to verify the limiting ecological factor’s presence in the watershed.*

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> progress towards removing limiting ecological factors or making improvements which address multiple limiting ecological factors |
| High: 6 pts | Important progress making improvements of a <i>high</i> quality which address limiting ecological factors |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> progress which address some limiting ecological factors |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> progress, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | <i>Not likely</i> to address limiting ecological factors in the project watershed <i>OR</i> documentation verifying limiting ecological factor <i>not included</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | <i>Potential minor worsening</i> of some limiting ecological factors in the project watershed |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Exacerbates</i> limiting ecological factors in the project watershed |

Category 3. Social or Cultural benefits

The evaluation of the social/cultural benefits of a project is based on the change in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project as demonstrated in the application.

3a. Does the project promote public health, public safety, and local food systems?

This public benefit includes: protection of drinking water sources, repair of septic systems/field, maintenance and repair of other water infrastructure, treatment and protection of drinking water itself, improved emergency response and advisory systems (e.g., WARN network, fish consumption advisories, water contact advisories, etc.), improved or protected water quality for human consumption and human contact (e.g., removal or prevention of toxics, contaminants of concern, bacteria), and the promotion of self-reliant and resilient food networks that connect food producers and food consumers in the same geographic region.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> promotion of public health, public safety or local food systems vital to the community |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High</i> quality of promotion of public health, public safety or local food systems |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> promotion |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> promotion of public health, public safety or local food systems, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Promotion of public health, public safety or local food systems <i>not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential for <i>minor negative impact</i> to public health, public safety, or local food systems |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Degrades</i> public health, public safety or local food systems |

3b. Does the project result in measurable improvements in conditions for Oregon’s environmental justice communities (e.g., minority or low-income communities, economically distressed rural communities, tribal communities, or other communities traditionally underrepresented in public processes)?

Environmental justice communities in Oregon are minority or low-income communities, economically distressed rural communities, tribal communities, or other communities traditionally underrepresented in public processes. Engagement could include outreach efforts to listen and involve environmental justice communities, solicit feedback on conditions in need of improvement, or communicate project description and anticipated outcomes.

Application tip: *Identify which of those communities would benefit from the project and quantify these benefits. Demonstrate that project-siting decisions have been examined and approved by affected landowners and affected environmental justice communities.*

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | <i>Exceptional</i> measurable improvements in conditions for environmental justice communities, <u>and</u> environmental justice communities were engaged in the process of developing projects |
| High: 6 pts | Improvements are of a <i>high quality and</i> <u>and</u> environmental justice communities were consulted or provided meaningful opportunity to engage |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> improvements and environmental justice communities were provided meaningful opportunity to engage |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> improvements, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Improved conditions <i>not likely</i> |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Likely to result in <i>minor detriment</i> in conditions for environmental justice communities |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | <i>Worse conditions</i> for environmental justice communities are likely |

3c. Does the project promote recreation and scenic values?

Recreation and scenic values include recreational fishing, motorized boating, non-motorized boating, and other forms of water-based recreation, swimming, fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing, sightseeing, hiking, photography, and aesthetic values. To promote those values means the project would improve the quality of or access to the examples identified.

Application tip: Evidence to support this benefit can be provided in the form of qualitative information, which may include interviews, professional opinion, or surveys.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | Exceptional promotion of recreation or scenic values, improving access and quality |
| High: 6 pts | <i>High quality of</i> promotion, improving access and quality |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> promotion, improving access or quality |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> promotion, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Benefit to recreation and scenic values <i>not likely</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Potential to detract from recreation and scenic values (minor detraction) |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | Moderate detractions from recreation and scenic values |

3d. Does this project contribute to the body of scientific data publicly available in this state?

Contributing to the body of scientific data means collecting new scientific information *and* making it available to the public. For example, data could be collected from water quality or habitat monitoring; groundwater studies or other investigations; new stream gages; or new monitoring wells. Contributions could also come from conducting a Seasonally Varying Flow analysis. Collection of scientific data is not sufficient to achieve this public benefit---the data must be made publicly available.

Application tip: Describe the equipment and/or methods that would be used and whether the data would be made available to the public. Note how this data supplies new information of particular significance to the project area.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | Exceptional contributions of new data to the body of scientific data publicly available in the state |
| High: 6 pts | High quality of data contributions |
| Medium: 3 pts | <i>Moderate</i> contributions |
| Minor: 1 pt | <i>Minor</i> contributions, <i>OR</i> benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | Contributions are unlikely or would occur regardless of the project |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Not applicable |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | Not applicable |

3e. Does this project promote state or local priorities, including but not limited to the restoration and protection of native fish species of cultural significance to Indian tribes?

A state or local priority is one that is identified in a plan, strategy, or study such as Oregon’s Integrated Water Resources Strategy, a place-based integrated water resources plan, the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, state and local water quality plans, species and habitat conservation or recovery plans/strategies, forestry plans, regional solutions priorities, local economic development plans, state or local hazard mitigation plans, etc. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife maintains a list of native fish species:

<http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/crp/freshwater.asp>.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | Exceptional role supporting a state and local priority |
| High: 6 pts | High quality role in supporting a state or local priority |
| Medium: 3 pts | Moderate role |
| Minor: 1 pt | Minor role, OR benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | No promotion of state or local priorities |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | May be counter to state or local priorities |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | Runs counter to state or local priorities |

3f. Does this project promote collaborative basin planning efforts, including but not limited to efforts under Oregon’s Integrated Water Resources Strategy?

Collaborative basin planning efforts incorporate public processes that are transparent and inclusive of diverse interests.

Application tip: *Demonstration of a collaborative planning effort may include publicly noticed meetings, posting agendas and decisions so they were publicly available, the inclusion of multiple types of water users represented in the process (e.g., instream interests, agricultural, municipal, domestic and industrial users), evidence that the project is supported by the community, and evidence that the project was identified in a Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Plan or another collaboratively developed strategic plan.*

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Exceptional: 12 pts | Project was identified in a collaboratively developed plan that is supported by all basin interests and where the public had meaningful opportunities to engage |
| High: 6 pts | Project was identified by a collaborative group that includes representation of multiple interests, where the public had meaningful opportunities to provide input |
| Medium: 3 pts | The project promotes the goals of a collaborative basin planning effort |
| Minor: 1 pt | An effort was made to engage and elicit input from the public, OR benefit claims are <i>unsupported or unquantified</i> |
| No benefit: 0 pts | <i>No change/impact</i> |
| Minor detriment: -1 pt | Stakeholders with differing perspectives and/or the public (as appropriate) were <i>not consulted</i> about the project and did not have opportunities to provide input |
| Medium detriment: -3 pts | Stakeholders with differing perspectives and/or the public (as appropriate) were <i>excluded</i> during project development |

Preference Points

For Water Project Grants and Loans and Irrigation Modernization Funding applications, a proposed project can receive up to 24 additional preference points. These points are not added to the public benefit category (economic, environmental, social/cultural) but are listed as “Other” in the evaluation summaries.

- For projects that propose to legally protect water instream, the score from question 2a will be doubled, for up to 12 additional points.
- For projects that include partnerships and collaboration, the score from question 3f will be doubled, for up to 12 additional points.

An application could score up to 72 points in each of the economic, environmental, and social/cultural public benefit categories. With the addition of the 24 preference points, there is a maximum public benefit score of 240 points.

For Irrigation Modernization Funding projects only, a project can receive an additional 10 preference points. These points are not added to the public benefit category (economic, environmental, social/cultural) but are listed as “Other” in the evaluation summaries.

- For projects involving surface water rights where the project conserves water, projects that legally protect a portion of the conserved water instream commensurate with the amount required under the approach described in ORS 537.470 will receive an additional 10 points.

With the addition of the 10 preference points, there is a maximum benefit score of 250 points for Irrigation Modernization projects.