

2011

**DOW Staff Scoring Criteria**

General Criteria

Project impact

Connectivity to a larger landscape, or impact on reducing fragmentation \*

Condition of the landscape

Urgent threat of development or similar situation

Strategic contribution to improving or protecting the management of a State Wildlife Area (such as an SWA inholding)

\* The “landscape scale” of a project will be considered in terms of the total protected acreage. In addition to the acreage of the project property, this consideration could include connectivity to adjacent protected property.

Big Game Habitat

Winter range value

Migration & movement corridor value

Summer or transitional range value

Species priority

Grouse (greater, Gunnison and Columbian sharptail species)

Species activity areas

Relative density during occupation

Affect if developed or converted

Geographic isolation

Breeding habitat and Conservation Plan Core Areas (greater sage grouse)

Hunting Access

Opportunity level/level of DOW control

Harvest potential

Accessible acres

Fishing Access

Priority level and level of DOW control

Permanent vs. term access

Warm vs. coldwater fishing

Proximity to an urban area

Miles of stream or of standing water

### Other Scoring Considerations

After scoring on habitat and/or recreational access (above)...

Point(s) may be added based on the following:

- The project conserves one priority attribute very well (i.e. is in the top 10% scores for the region or statewide, for one habitat type or access category, or includes unique and valuable attributes not otherwise scored).
- The project has catalyst potential for building relationships for future habitat conservation.
- The project will protect large acreage relative to the average of the region at a reasonable cost.
- The project budget indicates leverage or land donation of 25% or more, and the habitat value is good (e.g., when the raw score for the most important habitat/biological factors is at least 30 out of 50).
- The project is under particularly urgent threat of development meriting additional consideration beyond the "urgency" factor scored in the General Criteria matrix.

Point(s) may be subtracted based on the following:

- The project has an extremely high cost relative to the funds available. (If the project has merits outweighing this cost, those merits are considered elsewhere in the score.)
- The project involves a fee title purchase and is not an inholding or adjacent to a State Wildlife Area, or otherwise in a particularly strategic location, and the threat of development is not imminent.
- The project includes a known factor diminishing the quality of the habitat now or in the future (i.e., a situation requiring special restoration work, or a mineral lease that will almost certainly impact the property's future conservation values, or a reserved right for the landowner to subdivide the property.)
- There is an opportunity to protect another property in the immediate area that has habitat value at least as good as the subject property, and at a lower price or for some other reason. This involves a situation where there is merit to protecting one property before another in the same locale.
- For a high-scoring project, points might be subtracted if there is a good reason to delay negotiating the project (i.e., if time might resolve a situation particularly relevant to our interest in the property, or if delay is reasonable in order to complete a first phase before considering a second phase of a project.)