



Proposed Prioritization Criteria for Project Types

The following outlines the process for assessing project types to help identify priority levels within a subbasin. The prioritization process can be conceived of as a series of questions, wherein specific project types will be evaluated according to the criteria outlined in this memorandum. The prioritization process can be used to screen activities that are most likely to be proposed within a subbasin of the Middle Fork Willamette Watershed. Some project types may apply across the watershed as a whole.

Project Type Development & Prioritization Steps:

1. Stakeholders review the matrix of potential project types and actions that have been drawn from multiple reports and analyses, as well as from the first two stakeholder workshops. Stakeholders should make additions or modifications based upon their specific expertise and/or geographic knowledge.
2. The Technical Team will review comments and additions and create a final matrix per subbasin. The Team will score and prioritize the project types based on the criteria below.
3. Stakeholders will review draft priorities and participate in a workshop to further review and revise or validate. Stakeholders will identify specific actions for project types in each subbasin.
4. The Technical Team and Public will review the workshop results, make adjustments, and present the recommendations in a Final Report and Action Plan.

Prioritization Criteria

Each potential project type should be assessed according the following criteria:

1. ***SPECIES*** – *The extent to which the project type & location promotes the protection or recovery of an animal or plant species?*
 - Can be single species or guilds that use the same habitat. Includes species like Chinook salmon, bull trout, or upland species like Fender's blue butterfly or western meadowlark. Focus species should be drawn from the Oregon Natural Heritage data base, listed as endangered, threatened, sensitive, or of concern.
2. ***ECOTYPE*** – *Does the Project promote the protection or recovery of an important ecotype?*
 - Includes, sensitive or unique ecotypes in a basin, such as: oak woodlands, prairies, meadows, riparian woodlands, pine woodlands, old growth conifer forests, etc.
3. ***LOCATION*** – *Does the location include particularly favorable geography for restoration, mitigation, or preservation efforts?*



- Areas or subwatersheds that include particular streams with good recovery prospects, floodplain potential, or concentrations of rare upland habitats etc.
4. **RISK REDUCTION** – *Does the project reduce future risks to resources or communities?*
 - Risk reduction projects might include; brome control, decommissioning roads on unstable slopes, fuel reduction in fire prone areas, etc.
 5. **FUNDING** – *Is the project eligible, or potentially eligible for existing or anticipated funding?*
 - Project types that present the best opportunity to attract new funding or that have already secured funding.
 6. **PARTNERSHIPS** – *Are there existing or prospective “willing partners” for the project?*
 - Efforts that can take advantage of opportunities to work with willing partners in order to extend existing resources, and potentially leverage additional resources.
 7. **PROVEN EFFECTIVENESS** – *Has the project in question proven to be effective in previous efforts?*
 - Some project types have proven themselves to be very effective over the short term relative to resources spent (i.e. road decommissioning, culvert replacement). Others are more experimental (pulse releases from dams) or longer term (thinning riparian areas to produce large wood decades from now).
 8. **CATALYTIC PROJECTS** - *Does completing this project promote the implementation of other projects essential to improving watershed health?*
 - Some projects, like improved transport of salmon around dams, may have the potential to “unlock” additional restoration, mitigation, or preservation opportunities.
 9. **EDUCATION & AWARENESS** – *Does the project have the potential to provide environmental education or an enhanced awareness of key watershed issues?*
 - Projects located in publicly-visible areas are more likely to be seen by visitors and provide accessible locations for placing informational materials and conducting educational opportunities.

Prioritization Scoring Method

Projects that satisfy these criteria could be first tier priorities. Those that fit fewer would be second or third tier.

- 6-9 = Tier 1 Priority
- 3-5 = Tier 2 Priority
- 0-2 = Tier 3 Priority



Example: *Prairie restoration in lower watershed*

- Species recovery:** Fender's blue butterfly, western meadowlark, etc...
- Ecotype:** Willamette valley prairie grasslands (high conservation priority)
- Location:** Lower watershed has highest concentration of remnant prairies
- Risk:** High if untreated, continued gradual deterioration
- Funding:** Limited prospects & high competition
- Partnerships:** Several public & private landowner(s) willing to contribute resources
- Effectiveness:** Still somewhat experimental. Long term stewardship needed.
- Catalytic Projects:** Part of a network of habitat stepping stones Identified by TNC
- Education:** Visible to community. Informational sign on site. Tours possible

Tier 1: Meets at least 6 of 9 criteria

Note 1: Some projects may not meet more than one or a few criteria, but they may be very important to pursue nonetheless. We propose that a "consensus pass lane" should be provided for these projects, with explanations for why they should rank as Tier 1 regardless of the score.

Note 2: Ranking projects into tiers does not necessarily mean tier one projects will be done before tier 2 or 3. It may be that project selection will happen due to available funding or other opportunities that could make completion of a tier 3 project happen prior to a tier 1 project.

Note: Prioritization criteria developed by Dean Apostle, in collaboration with MFWWC Technical Team. Final criteria has been revised by MFWWC Executive Director and approved by Stakeholders Team.