

Parameters	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Notes	Hypothetical Project Descriptions:
<b>Number of Demand Group Water Quality Benefit (scores of 0 to 4)</b> <i>what critical issue is the project solving? Projects receive higher points for solving multiple critical issues.</i>					<p>This hypothetical project occurs in subwatershed 4.</p> <p>It has an estimated cost of \$30 million dollars.</p> <p><b>Project 1</b> It is an off-channel 10,000 acre-foot aboveground storage reservoir (approximately the size of wolf creek/thief valley).</p> <p>The critical issue this project is solving is late fall water shortage in subwatershed 6</p>
Agriculture					
Instream					
Municipal					
Natural Hazards					
Climate Change					
Certainty of the benefit (0-4; 4 is certain)					
<b>Number of Demand Group Water Quantity Benefit (scores of 0 to 4)</b> <i>what critical issue is the project solving? Projects receive higher points for solving multiple critical issues</i>					
Agriculture					
Instream					
Municipal					
Natural Hazards					
Climate Change					
Certainty of the benefit (0-4; 4 is certain)					
<b>Benefit Category</b> <i>Does the project benefit the watershed socially, economically, and environmentally? (scores of 0-3 for each category)</i>					<p>This hypothetical project occurs in subwatershed 6.</p> <p>It has an estimated cost of \$500,000 dollars.</p> <p><b>Project 2</b> It is converting 500 acres of land that is currently under flood irrigation to pivot irrigation (4 pivots).</p> <p>The critical issue this project is solving is late fall water shortage in subwatershed 6</p>
Social					
Economic					
Environmental					
<b>Impact Scale (scores of 1-4)</b> <i>Subwatersheds 2, 3, 6 receive one additional point each</i>					
Number of Subwatersheds (<2 =1, <4=2, <6=3, 8=4)					
<b>Cost Range/Value (scores of 1 to 4)</b>					
0-100k (4)					
100k-1M (3)					
1M-10M (2)					
>10M (1)					
<b>Funding (scores of 0 to 10)</b> <i>Projects receive higher points for secured funding, long term funding etc) and likelihood of receiving funding from a known source</i>					
Traditional (ie oweb, owrd, nracs, business oregon)					
Non-Traditional (ie ford family, meyer trust)					
<b>Flow impacts (Scores of 0-6)</b> <i>what does the project to do impact timing and duration of flow?</i>					
Improve flow volume at a time of year at which water is needed					
<b>Subwatershed Priority (Low=0, Moderate=1, High=4) (See chart)</b>					
Agriculture					
Instream					
Municipal					
Water Quality					
<b>Data Gaps (0-6)</b> <i>How significantly do data gaps identified in step 2 and 3 affect the outcome of this project?</i>					<p>The higher the number the higher the benefit.</p> <p>A successful project is one that obtains a score of 40 points or higher. In the event of multiple projects being within 10 points of each other, ties are broken by projects that benefit the most vulnerable subwatersheds (2,3,6,7).</p> <p>Once a project is deemed successful (40 or more points) "packages" of projects will be created and defined in the Step 5 action plan to secure funding.</p>
Data gap impact					
<b>Improvement Response Time (scores of 1 to 4)</b>					
<1 year (4)					
1-5 years (3)					
5-10 years (2)					
>10 years (1)					

**Legend and notes from stakeholders**

<b>Length of benefit (scores of 1 to 4)</b> <i>Short term benefits receive lower scores than long term benefits . Projects receive higher scores if benefits increase over time.</i>				
<1 year (1)				
1-5 years (2)				
5-10 years (3)				
>10 years (4)				
<b>Improvement Feasibility (scores of 1 to 10)</b> <i>"low-hanging fruit" projects are worth more</i>				
feasible (10)				
possible (8)				
unlikely (2)				
infeasible (1)				
Is there an existing program to do the work in the basin? (yes 3; no 0)				
Are there legal or regulatory barriers to do the work? (yes 0; no 3)				
<b>Cost to Benefit Ratio (scores of 0 to 4)</b>				
low cost, large benefit (4)				
medium cost, large benefit (3)				
high cost, large benefit (2)				
low cost, small benefit (4)				
low cost, medium benefit (3)				
medium cost, medium benefit (2)				
medium cost, high benefit (3)				
high cost, small benefit (0)				
high cost, medium benefit (2)				
<b>Broad Community Support (scores of 0 to 10)</b>				
Yes				
No				
<b>Known Negative Consequences (scores of 0 or 4)</b> <i>These may include items such as agricultural water conservation reducing natural recharge to streams, instream leases reducing water in-stream for agriculture etc</i>				
Yes(0)				
No (4)				
<b>Total (project must score 40 points to be recommended)</b>				

**Vulnerabilities by Subwatershed**

Name	Overall	Agricultural	Municipal	Instream	Water Quality
1 Lookingglass Creek/Cabin Creek	Low	Low	Low	High	High
2 Willow Creek/Indian Creek	Moderate	High	Low	High	High
3 Lower Five Points Creek	Moderate	High	Low	High	High
4 Beaver Creek, Upper Five Points Creek	Moderate	Low	Low	High	Moderate
5 Meadow Creek Upper Grande Ronde River	Low	Low	Low	High	Low
6 Ladd Creek Lower Catherine	High	High	Moderate	Very High	High
7 Upper Catherine Creek 1	High	High	Low	Very High	Moderate
8 Upper Catherine Creek 2	Low	Low	Low	High	Low