Criteria	Template Instruction/Notes
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	
1. Contiguous area of site (acres).	The size, in acres, of the candidate site.
BLM acres	(Suggested by TNC)
private acres	(Suggested by TNC)
State Trust acres	(Suggested by TNC)
2. For ACECs, reason for designation.	If the candidate site encompasses land in an ACEC, this field represents the value(s) present that the ACEC was established to protect. Enter N/A if site is not an ACEC.
3. VRM Class.	If the VRM class of a candidate site is higher than that of the SEZ, improvements provided by off-site mitigation would result in improvements to a higher VRM class.
4. Consistent with the Resource Management Plan?	√ for Yes, X for No based on whether mitigation actions are consistent with existing Resource Management Plan decisions. Applies only to BLM land, consider deleting if regional mitigation goals and objectives includes RMP goals and objectives.
5. Same HUC 4 watershed?	√ for Yes, X for No. The HUC 4 watershed is used to evaluate the sites; sites not in the same HUC 4 watershed as the SEZ would have a fairly strong hydrologic disconnect from the SEZ.
6. Mitigation tool (restoration/enhancement, acquisition, banking, withdrawal, special designation, etc.).	The type(s) of mitigation tool(s) that could be implemented at the site .
7. In SEZ Ecoregion?	√ for Yes if the site is in the same ecoregion as the SEZ. X for No if the site is not.
8. In SEZ ecological subregion?	√ for Yes, X for No.
9. Meets priorities for ESA critical habitat?	√ for Yes, X for No.
~~10. Mitigates unavoidable impacts to "least common and most geographically restricted species?"~~	√ for Yes, X for No. Use Notes field to list specific resources.
11. Mitigates for all or most identified unavoidable impacts that warrant offsite mitigation?	√ for Yes, X for No. Use Notes field to identify which resources.
12. Similar landscape value, ecological functionality, biological value, species, habitat types, and/or natural features?	√ for Yes, X for No. Site includes resources critical to meet mitigation objectives.
dominant vegetation community with mod-high integrity (acres)	Not scored. (Suggested by TNC)
13. Provides adequate geographic extent?	√ for Yes, X for No. Site provides an area for mitigation at least as large as the entire developable area of the SEZ.
Feasibility of action?	√ for Yes, X for No. (Suggested at Lessons Learned Workshop)
Links two or more protected areas?	√ for Yes, X for No. (Suggested at Lessons Learned Workshop)
Site and its proposed actions meet regional conservation/mitigation goals and objectives?	√ for Yes, X for No. (Suggested by Defenders of Wildlife)
14. Presence of unique/valuable resources or features?	Calculate score on the basis of the number of unique/valuable resources or features present at the candidate site, as listed for criteria 14a through 14f.
14a. Perennial, protected sources of water?	List specific resource(s).
14b. Unique species assemblages?	List specific resource(s).

Criteria	Template Instruction/Notes
AZGFD Species of Greatest Conservation Need (number of species from distribution models)	(Suggested by TNC)
Heritage Data Management System species (number of species from occurrence data)	(Suggested by TNC)
BLM Desert tortoise habitat	(Suggested by TNC)
14c. Protected species and/or critical habitat?	List specific resource(s).
14d. Desert washes or ephemeral playas?	List specific resource(s).
14e. Other?	List specific resource(s).
15. Sources of data for the site.	For example: Solar PEIS, Sonoran Rapid Ecoregional Assessment, BLM Interdisciplinary Team, Stakeholder.
EFFECTIVENESS / ADDITIONALITY	
16. To what extent can the full spectrum of regional mitigation goals/objectives be met simultaneously? Use scale of 0 (low) to 5 (high).	Rate the extent to which the regional mitigation goals/objectives can be met simultaneously through mitigation actions at the site, based on the following scale: all (100%) of the goals and objectives can be met (score of 5); 75-99% can be met (score of 4); 50-75% (score of 3); 25 - 49% can be met (score of 2); less than 25% can be met (score of 1); none of the goals/objectives can be met (score of 0).
17. How effective will the mitigation be in the context of achieving mitigation goals/objectives for conserving/restoring ecosystem intactness? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	Rate the effectiveness of the mitigation actions at the site in terms of achieving mitigation goals/objectives, based on the following scale: highly effective (score of 5); moderately effective (scores of 2-4), and minimally effective (score of 1).
18. For mitigation on BLM-administered lands, mitigation consists of actions not eligible for Bureau or other sources of funding?	√ for Yes, X for No.
FEASIBILITY	
What level of documentation is available to demonstrate effectiveness of mitigation action? Use scale of 1 (little to no documentation) to 5 (well-documented).	Score 5 for documented evidence of success; Score 1 for actions with little or no prior evidence of success.
19. Based on action required (e.g., restoration, BLM land management action, land acquisition, Congressional action), how difficult will implementation be? Use scale of 1 (difficult) to 5 (relatively easy).	Rate the mitigation action for difficulty of implementation (not necessarily taking into account the success rate or effectiveness - see above for score based on documentation), based on the following scale: restoration/enhancement actions (score of 5, relatively easy); BLM planning decisions (score of 3-4, less easy to moderately complicated); land acquisition actions (score 1-3, not very easy to moderately complicated); Congressional actions (score of 1, not very easy). Ratings should be adjusted on the basis of factors such as cost of the action; time and effort requirements; public and/or BLM support for or opposition to action; and, for land acquisitions, willingness of seller.
20. Time frame needed to establish site as mitigation location (estimated years).	Enter the estimated number or range of years required to establish the site as the location for mitigation action (e.g., number of years to establish priority on restoration actions at the site, number of years to acquire parcel of land).

Criteria	Template Instruction/Notes
21. Time frame for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from implementation (estimated years).	From first date of implementation, enter the estimated number or range of years required to implement actions and achieve mitigation goals and objectives.
22. Cost estimate.	Enter a total and per-acre cost estimate for the proposed mitigation action(s) at the site, including cost of restoration and enhancement actions, future maintenance costs (e.g., weed management), land acquisition costs, enforcement costs, BLM management costs.
DURABILITY	
23. How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	Rate the temporal and managerial durability of the mitigation action, based on the following scale: Congressionally protected lands would be very durable (score of 5); other federally administered lands specifically designated in land use plans or withdrawn by public land order would be moderately to very durable (score of 4-5); federally administered lands without any special designation but with enforcement oversight would have limited durability (score of 2-3); lands without special designation or enforcement oversige would not be very durable (score of 1).
24. How durable would the mitigation be in the context of permanence of conservation and biodiversity protections? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).
RISK	
25. What are the constraints or threats to success?	List the constraints or threats present at the site or in the surrounding area that could jeopardize long-term success of the mitigation action(s). Include acreage of prior land use designation if they exist (e.g., corridors, mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing, OHV trails, etc.)
26. To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success? Use scale of 1 (considerable) to 5 (low).	Rate the extent to which surrounding land uses and stressors (e.g., proximity to expanding urban areas, pressures on region for recreational land use, excessive groundwater withdrawl and drawdown conditions that could affect resources on the mitigation site) would jeopardize long-term success of the mitigation actions, based on the following scale: if surrounding land uses are similar to or compatible with mitigation actions, the impact would be low (score of 5); if surrounding land uses are incompatible with mitigation actions or present significant pressure for use of the site for incompatible uses, the impact would be considerable (score of 1); surrounding land uses falling within this range would be assessed to determine degree of impact (score of 2-4).
27. What is the relative probablility of success? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	Rate the relative probability of success of the actions at the mitigation site, based on the combination of factors evaluated in criteria 15 through 24, giving a score of 5 (high probability of success), a score of 1 (low probability of success), and scores of 2-4 to represent moderate degrees of probability of success.
Cumulative benefit for resources? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	(Suggested at Lessons Learned Workshop)
PRELIMINARY RANKING	Calculate score by summing the entries in blue-shaded cells. Scores are calculated based on entries in blue-shaded cells as follows: all scaled values (i.e., ratings from 1 to 5) are summed; 1 pt is added for each check mark (√); 2 pts are deleted for each X.