

Economic	The evaluation of economic benefits for a project shall be based on the changes in economic conditions expected to result from the project, including but not limited to conditions related to:	Max Unit Score	Raw Score
	(a) Job creation or retention;	5	
	(b) Increases in economic activity;	5	
	(c) Increases in efficiency or innovation;	5	
	(d) Enhancement of infrastructure, farmland, public resource lands, industrial lands, commercial lands or lands having other key uses;	5	
	(e) Enhanced economic value associated with tourism or recreational or commercial fishing, with fisheries involving native fish of cultural significance to Indian tribes or with other economic values resulting from restoring or protecting water in-stream; and	5	
	(f) Increases in irrigated land for agriculture.	5	
	Total Economic (Max score is 30)	30	
Environmental	The evaluation of environmental benefits for a project shall be based on the changes in environmental conditions expected to result from the project, including but not limited to conditions related to:		
	(a) A measurable improvement in protected streamflows that: (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;	5	
	(b) A measurable improvement in groundwater levels that enhances environmental conditions in ground water restricted areas or other areas;	5	
	(c) A measurable improvement in the quality of surface water or groundwater;	5	
	(d) Water conservation;	5	
	(e) Increased ecosystem resiliency to climate change impacts; and	5	
	(f) Improvements that address one or more limiting ecological factors in the project watershed.	5	
	Total Environmental (Max score is 30)	30	
Social or Cultural	The evaluation of the social or cultural benefits for a project shall be based on the changes in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project, including but not limited to conditions related to:		
	(a) The promotion of public health and safety and of local food systems;	5	
	(b) A measurable improvement in conditions for members of minority or low-income communities, economically distressed rural communities, tribal communities or other communities traditionally underrepresented in public processes;	5	
	(c) The promotion of recreation and scenic values;	5	
	(d) Contribution to the body of scientific data publicly available in this state;	5	
	(e) The promotion of state or local priorities, including but not limited to the restoration and protection of native fish species of cultural significance to Indian tribes; and	5	
	(f) The promotion of collaborative basin planning efforts, including but not limited to efforts under the state integrated water resources strategy.	5	
	Total Social or Cultural (Max score is 30)	30	
Total Public Benefit Score (Max score is 90)		90	

Scale Used in Evaluation of Public Benefits

- Negative one point = There is a negative impact
- Zero points = Insufficient information available to score this category
- One point = Project is likely to yield little-to-no improvements or benefits; or project claims of improvements are unsupported / unquantified.
- Two points = Project is likely to yield minor improvements or benefits;
results supported with data, professional opinion, narrative of qualified person(s), or other acceptable documentation
- Three points = Project is likely to yield moderate improvements or benefits;
results supported with data, professional opinion, narrative of qualified person(s), or other acceptable documentation
- Four points = Project is likely to yield significant improvements or benefits;
results supported with data, professional opinion, narrative of qualified person(s), or other acceptable documentation
- Five points = Project is likely to yield exceptional improvements or benefits, unusually high standard or quality;
results supported with data, professional opinion, narrative of qualified person(s), or other acceptable documentation

Category 1. Economic Benefits of a Project, based on the change in economic conditions expected to result from the project.	
1a	Does the project create or retain jobs?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to directly or indirectly create or retain jobs (See note below); or • Project makes job creation claims that are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely has minor effects on job creation or retention.
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely has moderate effects on job creation or retention.
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely has significant effects on job creation or retention.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely has exceptional effects on job creation or retention.

NOTE: Direct effects refer to job creation or retention with the organization that owns or operates the project. Indirect effects refer to job creation or retention with retail customers or consumers of the project.

Category 1. Economic Benefits of a Project, based on the change in economic conditions expected to result from the project.	
1b	Does the project increase economic activity?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to increase economic activity (See note below); or • Project makes job creation claims that are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely results in minor, short-term (less than two years) increases in economic activity.
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely results in moderate increases in economic activity for one to two years.
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely results in significant increases in economic activity for three to four years.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project likely results in exceptional increases in economic activity for five or more years.

NOTE: economic activity includes but is not limited to the arrival of new firms, renewed contracts, or increased orders, production, gross sales, or net revenue, compared to the year preceding project completion. Such economic activity could occur within one or more entities / businesses.

Category 1. Economic Benefits of a Project, based on the change in economic conditions expected to result from the project.	
1c	Does the project increase efficiency or innovation?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to result in efficiency or innovation, time, energy or water efficiencies; or • Project makes claims of innovation or innovation that are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to result in minor efficiency or innovation, time, energy or water system efficiencies.
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to result in moderate efficiency or innovation, time, energy or water system efficiencies.
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to result in significant efficiency or innovation, time, energy or water system efficiencies.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to result in exceptional efficiency or innovation, time, energy or water system efficiencies.

NOTE: Water conservation is addressed elsewhere so focus on time savings, innovative production techniques, energy savings (the energy required to move, treat, or heat water); or water system efficiencies such as system redundancy (back-up, inter-ties).

Category 1. Economic Benefits of a Project, based on the change in economic conditions expected to result from the project.	
1d	Does the project enhance infrastructure, farmland, public resource lands, industrial lands, commercial lands or lands having other key uses?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to enhance infrastructure or land; or • Project makes claims re enhancements to infrastructure and land that are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to provide minor enhancements of infrastructure or land, increasing property value.
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to provide moderate enhancements of infrastructure or land, increasing property value.
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to provide significant enhancements of infrastructure or land, increasing property value.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to provide exceptional enhancements of infrastructure or land, increasing property value.

NOTE: Since production, sales, and revenues are addressed in 1b, focus on the re-sale or rental value of the land in 1d; look at the SB 839 economic subgroup paper Appendix E for ideas about quantifying the increased value of farmland with additional access to water. Also, consider improvements such as maintained, repaired, or upgraded infrastructure; maintained or buffered riparian areas; and maintained or improved soils.

Category 1. Economic Benefits of a Project, based on the change in economic conditions expected to result from the project.	
1e	Does the project enhance the economic value of tourism, recreation, navigation, or fishing (recreational, commercial, or tribal), water quality, or scenic waterways?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to change the economic value of tourism, recreation, navigation, fishing, water quality or scenic waterways; or • Project makes claims in these categories that are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• Project is likely to result in minor increased value of tourism, recreation, navigation, fishing, water quality or scenic waterways.
3 pts	• Project is likely to result in moderate increased value of tourism, recreation, navigation, fishing, water quality or scenic waterways.
4 pts	• Project is likely to result in significant increased value of tourism, recreation, navigation, fishing, water quality or scenic waterways.
5 pts	• Project is likely to result in minor increased value of tourism, recreation, navigation, fishing, water quality or scenic waterways.

NOTE: Look at the SB 839 economic subgroup paper Figures 12 and 13 for ideas for valuing instream uses. Examples could include expected increase in daily park fees, tour guide revenues; boat or gear rentals; or fishing licenses. Leave willingness to pay for recreation or scenic values to 3c — duplicative. Leave expected improvement in water quality parameters (e.g., temperature or dissolved oxygen) to 2c — duplicative.

Category 1. Economic Benefits of a Project, based on the change in economic conditions expected to result from the project.	
1f	Does the project result in increases in irrigated land for agriculture?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is unlikely to increase number of irrigated acres; or • Project claims regarding increased irrigated acres are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• Project is likely to increase irrigated acres by up to 5 percent.
3 pts	• Project is likely to increase irrigated acres by up to 10 percent.
4 pts	• Project is likely to increase irrigated acres by up to 25 percent.
5 pts	• Project is likely to increase irrigated acres by at least 25 percent.

NOTE: Increased re-sale or rental value is already addressed in 1d, so focus here on expanded quantity of land (acreage) not improved quality of land.

Category 2. Environmental Benefits of a Project, based on the change in environmental conditions expected to result from the project.	
2a	Does the project result in measurable improvements in protected streamflows?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little-to-no streamflow is protected instream.; or • Project claims regarding protected streamflows are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 24 percent of new project water (or equivalent volume) is protected instream. •
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 to 49 percent of new project water (or equivalent volume) is protected instream. •
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 to 74 percent of new project water (or equivalent volume) is protected instream.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75 to 100 percent of new project water (or equivalent volume) is protected instream.

NOTE: Protected streamflow means water that remains in or is released into the natural channel and is legally protected by the state, using tools such as instream water rights or permit conditions. Example uses of this water are called out in SB 839 and include support of the natural hydrograph, improvement of floodplain functions, support of state or federally listed STE fish species, support of native fish species of cultural importance to Indian tribes, and support of riparian habitat important for wildlife.

Category 2. Environmental Benefits of a Project, based on the change in environmental conditions expected to result from the project.	
2b	Does the project result in measurable improvements in groundwater levels that enhance environmental conditions in groundwater restricted areas or other areas?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is not likely to improve or stabilize groundwater levels; or • Project claims regarding improvements in groundwater levels are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is likely to stabilize or yield minor improvements in groundwater levels.
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is likely to result in moderate improvements in groundwater levels.
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is likely to result in significant improvements in groundwater levels.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is likely to result in exceptional improvements in groundwater levels.

NOTE: This question focuses on groundwater levels (quantitative measurement). Stabilization or improvements in groundwater levels could come from aquifer storage and recovery (ASR), artificial recharge (AR) projects, natural recharge, or discontinued / reduced groundwater use.

Category 2. Environmental Benefits of a Project, based on the change in environmental conditions expected to result from the project.	
2c	Does the project result in measurable improvements in the quality of surface water or groundwater?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to improve water quality; or • Project claims regarding improved water quality are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to yield a minor improvement to water quality.
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to yield a moderate improvement to water quality.
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to yield a significant improvement to water quality.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to yield an exceptional improvement to water quality.

NOTE: Improved water quality could encompass a number of parameters including, but not limited to, the following: temperature, dissolved oxygen, contaminated sediments, toxic substances, bacteria, or nutrients. Improvements could come from a higher quality of water discharged to surface water or injected into groundwater, or from increased flow, or from treatment or filtration of water already in the environment.

Category 2. Environmental Benefits of a Project, based on the change in environmental conditions expected to result from the project.	
2d	Does the project result in water conservation?
-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
0 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to reduce water use through conservation measures; or • Project claims regarding water conservation are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to see 1 to 5 percent reduction in water use to achieve the same outcomes.
3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to see 6 to 20 percent reduction in water use to achieve the same outcomes.
4 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to see 21 to 40 percent reduction in water use to achieve the same outcomes.
5 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is likely to see at least a 41 percent reduction in water use to achieve the same outcomes.

NOTE: Water conservation, as defined in state law, is a means of eliminating waste or otherwise improving the efficiency of water use by modifying the technology or method of diverting, transporting, applying, or recovering water. Applicants should identify the technology or technique they are using, and then quantify the water savings they will achieve, compared to what they used previously to achieve the same outcome.

Category 2. Environmental Benefits of a Project, based on the change in environmental conditions expected to result from the project.	
2e	Does the project increase ecosystem resiliency to climate change impacts?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is not likely to increase ecosystem resiliency to climate change; or • Project claims regarding increased ecosystem resiliency are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• Project is likely to result in a minor increase in ecosystem resiliency to climate change.
3 pts	• Project is likely to result in a moderate increase in ecosystem resiliency to climate change.
4 pts	• Project is likely to result in a significant increase in ecosystem resiliency to climate change.
5 pts	• Project is likely to result in an exceptional increase in ecosystem resiliency to climate change.

NOTE: Ecosystem resiliency to climate change could include increasing streamflow (duplicative of 2a); increasing natural storage (e.g., wetlands, upland meadows); decreasing water temperature, protecting or enhancing cold-water habitat, restoring floodplain connectivity and backwater habitats, restoring stream buffers, decreasing risk of drought, fire, plant disease, and invasive species outbreak; decreasing coastal erosion and inundation.

Category 2. Environmental Benefits of a Project, based on the change in environmental conditions expected to result from the project.	
2f	Does the project address limiting ecological factors in the project watershed?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is not likely to address limiting ecological factors; or • Project claims about addressing limiting ecological factors are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• The project is likely to make minor progress towards removing limiting ecological factors.
3 pts	• The project is likely to make moderate progress towards removing limiting ecological factors.
4 pts	• The project is likely to make significant progress towards removing limiting ecological factors.
5 pts	• The project is likely to make exceptional progress towards removing limiting ecological factors.

NOTE: Limiting factors must be identified by peer reviewed scientific reports or studies from a state or federal agency. This is a wildcard that will likely give preference or weight to categories already mentioned. Examples include: improvement of fish passage, habitat for STE species, water quality, or streamflow. Applicants will need to cite public reports or studies that identify these limiting ecological factors.

Category 3. Social or Cultural Benefits of a Project, based on the change in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project.	
3a	Does the project promote public health, public safety, and local food systems?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	• The project is not likely to promote public health, public safety or local food systems; or • Project claims regarding improved public health, public safety or local food systems is unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• The project is likely to promote minor improvements in public health, public safety or local food systems.
3 pts	• The project is likely to promote moderate improvements in public health, public safety or local food systems.
4 pts	• The project is likely to promote significant improvements in public health, public safety or local food systems.
5 pts	• The project is likely to promote exceptional improvements in public health, public safety or local food systems.

NOTES: Examples include protection of drinking water sources (both surface water and groundwater); maintenance or 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 (e.g., removal or prevention of toxics, contaminants of concern, bacteria) – duplicates 2c above, although for human consumption and human contact, not environmental protection; increased local food production – duplicates 1b above.

Category 3. Social or Cultural Benefits of a Project, based on the change in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project.	
3b	Does the project improve 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)?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	• Project is not likely to benefit an environmental justice community; or • Environmental justice communities were not consulted in the process of developing the project; or • Project claims regarding improved conditions for environmental justice communities are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• Project is likely to provide minor benefits to environmental justice community, <u>and</u> • Environmental justice communities were consulted in the process of developing projects.
3 pts	• Project is likely to provide moderate benefits to environmental justice community, <u>and</u> • Environmental justice communities were consulted in the process of developing projects.
4 pts	• Project is likely to provide significant benefits to environmental justice community, <u>and</u> • Environmental justice communities were consulted in the process of developing projects.
5 pts	• Project is likely to provide exceptional benefits to environmental justice community, <u>and</u> • Environmental justice communities were consulted in the process of developing projects.

NOTE: Applicants will need to identify the communities benefitting from the project and quantify these benefits. Demonstrate that siting decisions were vetted and approved by affected landowners and environmental justice communities.

Category 3. Social or Cultural Benefits of a Project, based on the change in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project.	
3c	Does the project promote recreation and scenic values?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is likely to result in little to no promotion of recreation or scenic values; or • Project claims of promoted recreation and scenic values are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• The project is likely to result in minor promotion of recreation or scenic values.
3 pts	• The project is likely to result in a moderate promotion of recreation or scenic values.
4 pts	• The project is likely to result in significant promotion of recreation or scenic values.
5 pts	• The project is likely to result in exceptional promotion of recreation or scenic values.

NOTE: This is going to be duplicative of 1e and 2a above. Information will probably be in the form of qualitative “testimonials” (e.g., interviews, professional opinion, or surveys of household willingness to pay for improvement or preservation of river flows.) The following use categories may be used to identify “promotion of recreation and scenic values”: recreational fishing, motorized boating, non-motorized boating, other forms of water-based recreation, swimming, fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing, sightseeing, hiking, photography, aesthetic values.

Category 3. Social or Cultural Benefits of a Project, based on the change in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project.	
3d	Does this project contribute to the body of scientific data publicly available in this state?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is not expected to contribute to the body of scientific data publicly available in the state; or • Project claims of scientific contribution are unsupported or unquantified.
2 pts	• The project is likely to contribute a minor amount of new data to the body of scientific data publicly available in the state.
3 pts	• The project is likely to contribute a moderate amount of new data to the body of scientific data publicly available in the state.
4 pts	• The project is likely to contribute a significant amount of new data to the body of scientific data publicly available in the state.
5 pts	• The project is likely to contribute an exceptional amount of new data to the body of scientific data publicly available in the state.

Note any new stream gages, monitoring wells, or other measurement devices whose data will be available to the Water Resources Department and its stakeholders. Will this equipment include telemetry or transponders that make data available in near real time? Note any plan to calibrate and maintain the equipment.

Category 3. Social or Cultural Benefits of a Project, based on the change in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project.	
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?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	• Project is unlikely to support a state or local priority, or its impacts are not well quantified, or supported.
2 pts	• Project is likely to play a minor role, supporting a state or local priority.
3 pts	• Project is likely to play a moderate role, supporting a state or local priority.
4 pts	• Project is likely to play a significant role, supporting a state or local priority.
5 pts	• Project is likely to play an exceptional role, supporting a state or local priority.

NOTE: Cite reports or studies identifying these local priorities, including Oregon’s Integrated Water Resources Strategy, TMDLs, recovery plans, forestry plans, etc. This may be duplicative of 2f, which in essence gives it greater weight.

Category 3. Social or Cultural Benefits of a Project, based on the change in social or cultural conditions expected to result from the project.	
3f	Does this project promote collaborative basin planning efforts, including but not limited to efforts under the state Integrated Water Resources Strategy?
-1	•
0 pts	• Insufficient information available to score this category
1 pt	• Project was not developed out of a collaborative basin planning effort (i.e., multiple stakeholders from different perspectives were not consulted, but wanted to be); or • Project claims regarding collaboration were unsupported or undocumented.
2 pts	• Project made minor attempts at a collaborative process.
3 pts	• Project made moderate attempts at a collaborative process.
4 pts	• Project made significant attempts at a collaborative process.
5 pts	• Project made exceptional attempts at a collaborative process.

NOTE: Look for evidence of a public process that was transparent and inclusive. Are multiple types of water users represented in the process (e.g., instream interests, agricultural, municipal, and industrial users)? Does the project meet multiple water needs? Is the project identified in an Integrated Water Resources Place-Based Plan?