

WORKING DRAFT – WORKSHOP 2 COLORADO SRMS

Draft Screening Matrix for Regional Mitigation Sites for Colorado SEZs
(Criteria highlighted in blue are those that contribute to the Site Scoring)

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
SITE CHARACTERISTICS										
1. Total area of site (acres)	9,712	2,650	1,064	25,910	11,930	122,762	20,837	10,973	17,659	1,576
BLM acres	9,712	2,650	1,064	40	8,061	19,564	12,684	10,973	5	1,576
Private acres				25,870	3,226	85,813	5,456		2,547	
County Lands					643	9,724	1,112		0	
State Trust acres						4,386				
State Park Lands						1,286				
State Wildlife Areas						1,989			264	
NPS										
FWS									14,842	
FS							1,585			
Tribal Lands										
BOR										
2. For ACECs, reason for designation				N/A	Taos Plateau ACEC- scenic, water quality & quantity, wetlands, wildlife habitat, Sensitive Species (Pinyon Jay, Townsends big-eared bat, Spotted bat, bald eagle)	Blanca Wetlands ACEC- wetlands, wildlife, wetlands related recreation	Protect scenic integrity of railroad	Wetlands, wildlife, recreation	N/A	N/A
3. VRM and VRI ¹ Class	VRM – ~5% III, 95% IV; VRI – ~5% II, 40% III, 55% IV	VRM – III; VRI - III	VRM – III; VRI - III		VRM - II				VRM - III	
4. Consistent with the Resource Management Plan?	Yes - RMP amended by PEIS ROD	Yes - RMP amended by PEIS ROD	Yes - RMP amended by PEIS ROD	N/A	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:					Taos RMP; Monument designation, Land and Water Conservation Fund	2014 RMP Amendment, Land and Water Conservation Fund Proposals	BLM RMP Visual Resources, FS, others		SLV USFWS CCP	
5. Same HUC 4 watershed?	Rio Grande	Rio Grande	Rio Grande	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
6. Current landscape condition score? (Using Landscape Assessment)	High: 7,389; Mod High: 1,616; Mod Low: 519; Low: 188	Mod High: 518; Mod Low: 511; Low: 34	High: 628; Mod High: 1,740; Mod Low: 282							

¹ Blue text indicates new criteria for the candidate site matrix.

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
7. Mitigation tool (restoration/enhancement, acquisition, banking, withdrawal, special designation, etc.)				<p>Action 1. Negotiate and acquire non-federal parcels from willing landowners, or establish private lands conservation easements.</p> <p>Action 2. Install wildlife friendly fence at 2.5 miles of fence removed/100 acres SEZ developed), 3 miles for big game habitat and movement improvements.</p> <p>Action 3. Install wildlife water enhancements (i.e., stock tanks; spring enhancement)</p> <p>Action 4: Augment law enforcement capabilities to reduce unauthorized uses.</p>	<p>Action 1. Pronghorn fawning habitat - seasonal closure & conservation measure enforcement (hiding).</p> <p>Action 2. Shrubland - Grassland vegetation - pollinator restoration.</p> <p>Action 3. Fencing removal &/or modification (wildlife friendly fencing);</p> <p>Action 4. Fencing to create reserve common allotments.</p> <p>Action 5. Raptor friendly transmission mitigation fund.</p>	<p>Action 1. Replace desert shrub - grassland wildlife habitat lost by SEZ development through land acquisition (willing sellers- Land and Water Conservation Fund).</p> <p>Action 2. Offset lake effect impacts through land/water acquisition of emergent habitats (willing sellers- LWCF).</p> <p>Action 3. Acquire augmentation water for Blanca Wetlands wells, to protect wetlands habitat.</p> <p>Action 4. Re-drill Blanca Wetlands wells to produce adjudicated flows to create more wetlands.</p> <p>Action 5. Construct infrastructure improvements (i.e. ditches, dykes, headgates, etc.) to maximize wetlands habitats by maximizing existing water rights/water use efficiencies.</p> <p>Action 6. Replace or offset groundwater recharge area lost due to solar development.</p> <p>Action 7. Enhance/protect Old Spanish Trail/NHT/culturally significant areas and provide additional educational/interpretative opportunities.</p> <p>Action 8. Install wildlife friendly fence or remove ineffective and/or unneeded fencing.</p> <p>Action 9. Augment land use compliance monitoring and enforcement capabilities.</p>	<p>Action 1. Create BLM-County partnership to assist with county transfer station development, promote trash clean up events, enforce trash dumping compliance; clean trash dump sites.</p> <p>Action 2. Enhance travel corridor visual and scenic resource quality; rectify color contrast-painting to current high contrast structures, and/or historic restoration of buildings in Antonito et al.</p> <p>Action 3. Partner to restore SHPO & NHA identified historic buildings in Conejos County Antonito et al.</p> <p>Action 4. Install state-line wildlife friendly fence and wildlife water enhancements.</p>	<p>Action 1. Consult with TCP affected communities to identify how Fourmile development would adversely affect them.</p> <p>Action 2. Change RMP land use allocation and exclusion to Fourmile SEZ amendment in response to cultural information gained in BLM ethnography study (2013).</p> <p>Action 3. Establish cultural and ecological mitigation bank(s).</p> <p>Action 4. Enhance Old Spanish Trail East Fork NHT.</p> <p>Action 5: Conduct timber thinning operations to rectify adverse visual effects of historic chaining on Blanca slopes.</p>	<p>Action 1. Install wildlife friendly fence.</p> <p>Action 2. Develop wildlife water enhancements (i.e. stock tanks, spring enhancements).</p> <p>Action 3. Establish mitigation/conservation banks land acquisition/easements, riparian and upland habitat restoration.</p> <p>Action 4. Install fence and powerline avian collision deterrents and/or buried powerlines.</p> <p>Action 5. Create additional wetland acreage through water right acquisition and enhancements to attract migratory birds</p> <p>Action 6.- Increase Groundwater recharge & protection by applying water to wetlands,</p> <p>Action 7.- Identify and enhance W- Folk Old Spanish Trail</p> <p>Action 8. Lease farmed circles to provide crane forage.</p>	<p>Action 1. Designate new 1500 acre McIntire Simpson ACEC in RMP revision.</p> <p>Action 2. Acquire augmentation water for McIntire Simpson wells.</p> <p>Action 3. Re-drill McIntire Simpson wells to produce adjudicated amount to create more wetlands.</p> <p>Action 4. Establish conservation easement to provide riparian or emergent habitats.</p> <p>Action 5. Construct stream rehabilitation and erosion control structures.</p> <p>Action 6. Acquire 0.10 cfs of Conejos river winter flows/acre of SEZ development.</p> <p>Action 7. Construct infrastructure improvements (i.e. ditches, dykes, headgates, etc.),to maximize existing water rights and water use efficiencies.</p>
Justification:										
8. In SEZ Ecoregion??	San Luis Valley - Taos Plateau Study Area	San Luis Valley - Taos Plateau Study Area	San Luis Valley - Taos Plateau Study Area	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
9. In SEZ ecological subregion?	San Luis Shrublands & Hills	San Luis Alluvial Flats & Wetlands	Salt Flats		√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
10. If applicable, meets priorities for ESA critical habitat?	No Critical Habitat	No Critical Habitat	No Critical Habitat		X	X	X	X	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat: not designated	ESA Critical Habitat designated for Southwestern Willow Flycatcher
11. Mitigates for all or most identified residual impacts that warrant regional mitigation?		Resources for Mitigation: terrestrial wildlife habitat, inter-mountain basins semi-desert shrub steppe, winterfat, shortgrass, migratory birds and raptors, special status species, EJ, hydrology, soils, visual resources	Resources for Mitigation: terrestrial wildlife habitat, inter-mountain basins semi-desert shrub steppe, winterfat, shortgrass, migratory birds and raptors, special status species, EJ, hydrology, soils, visual resources	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	Resources for Mitigation: terrestrial wildlife habitat, inter-mountain basins semi-desert shrub steppe, winterfat, shortgrass, migratory birds and raptors, special status species, EJ, hydrology, soils, visual resources	Resources for Mitigation: terrestrial wildlife habitat, inter-mountain basins semi-desert shrub steppe, winterfat, shortgrass, migratory birds and raptors, special status species, EJ, hydrology, soils, visual resources	Resources for Mitigation: terrestrial wildlife habitat, inter-mountain basins semi-desert shrub steppe, winterfat, shortgrass, migratory birds and raptors, special status species, EJ, hydrology, soils, visual resources	Hydrology, soils, SS, Pronghorn, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Visual, Raptor, Mtn Plover, Swift Fox, Potentially Eligible Cultural Features	Big game, Pronghorn, wildlife corridor, connectivity, Pollinators, Visual, Raptor, Eligible and potentially Eligible Cultural Features, shorebirds/waterbirds, hydrology, soils, SS,	Wetlands/migratory birds/shorebirds, Grassland, Pronghorn/Big game/terrestrial, Bats, GRSA, ACEC, Refuge, SS, T&E, Visual, E. Fork Old Spanish Trail/cultural	NHL, Visual, Migration Corridor, Wilderness, LWC (to be re-assessed), W Fork Old Spanish Trail	E. Fork Old Spanish Trail, GRSA, Baca refuge, Wetlands, Visuals, WSA, Wilderness	Migratory bird & raptors, flyways, Wetlands, Special status species, hydrology, Pronghorn/mule deer Migration Corridor, Connectivity with conservation easements,	Hydrology, soils, Sensitive Species, Pronghorn, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Visual, Raptor, Mtn Plover, Swift Fox, Potentially Eligible Cultural Features, shorebirds/waterbirds

² The San Luis Valley Ecoregion is comprised of five Level IV subregions: San Luis Shrublands and Hills, San Luis Alluvial Flats and Wetlands, Salt Flats, Sand Dunes and Sand Sheets, and Taos Plateau.

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
12. Similar landscape value, ecological functionality, biological value, species, habitat types, and/or natural features?				√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); depending on whether site includes resources critical to meet mitigation objectives. Justification:					√ for pronghorn fawning habitat value in landscape context - compliments winterfat habitat - mitigates for pronghorn critical habitat type. Same cultural landscape as SEZ.					
13. Dominant vegetation and condition	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub Steppe (8352 acres); Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Grassland (1263 acres) Current Condition: Very High: 0 High: 76% Mod. High: 17% Mod. Low: 5% Low: 2% Very Low: 0	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub Steppe (2624 acres) Current Condition: Very High: 0 High: 24% Mod. High: 65% Mod. Low: 11% Low: 0 Very Low: 0	Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub Steppe (554 acres); Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub (277 acres); Inter-Mountain Basins Greasewood Flat (145 acres) Current Condition: Very High: 0 High: 0 Mod. High: 49% Mod. Low: 48% Low: 3% Very Low: 0			?	?	?	? - upland of Refuge	
Justification:										
14. Provides adequate geographic extent?				√	√	√	√	√	√	X
√ for Yes, X for No. depending on whether site provides area for mitigation at least as large as the entire developable area of the SEZ.										
15. Feasibility of action?				√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
16. Links two or more protected areas?				√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:				Links to Rio Grande, Upland habitat, RGNA-ACEC's (San Luis Hills & Rio Grande Corridor).	Links Northern Rio Grande NHA - Rio Grande Wild & Scenic River - Rio Grande de Norte National Monument	Great Sand Dunes NP, Baca NWR, State Park, State Wildlife Area, FS Special Interest Area (SIA); BLM SRMA; TNC easement	√ BLM ACECs x2, Wilderness, WSA, Migration corridors around Monument	NPS, Baca FWS Refuge, FS Special Interest Area (SIA); TNC easements & ownership, Blanca Wetlands ACEC, WSA, SRMA - Zapata, Blanca WL	FWS Monte Vista Refuge, RiGHT easements,	Links to Rio Grande via conservation easement, State Historic Site.
17. Site and its proposed actions meet regional conservation/ mitigation goals and objectives?				√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:					Provides critical pronghorn fawning habitat, ecology-vegetation, cultural resources, visual, dust abatement, big game habitat, Gunnison's Prairie Dog, burrowing habitat, EJ					

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
18. 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 18a through 18f.)										
18a. Perennial, protected sources of water?	Alta Lake	None	None	Rio Grande River	No	Blanca Wetlands, San Luis Lake/Head Lake complex, Baca NWR, Great Sand Dunes NP	Rio San Antonio	Sangres drainages, Artesian Wells/Springs, Big Springs	Rio Grande, Rock Creek	Conejos River, McSimpson spring, artesian wells
18b. Unique species assemblages?	Grassland fauna assemblage, big game seasonal habitat	Grassland fauna assemblage, big game seasonal habitat	Grassland fauna assemblage, big game seasonal habitat	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Yellow-billed cuckoo habitat, bighorn sheep; golden eagle, bald eagle, otter; riparian species assemblage, pronghorn; big game habitats; tarantula migrations	Pinyon-Juniper Sagebrush	Shorebirds-Waterbirds; unique macro invertebrate species; Sand Dunes Ecosystem,	Gunnison's Prairie Dog	Shorebirds-Waterbirds; Sand Dunes Ecosystem	Sandhill cranes, Southwestern Willow flycatcher, swainsons hawk, Gunnison's Prairie Dog, Mountain plover	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Yellow-billed cuckoo habitat, bald eagle, golden eagle, otter; riparian species assemblage, pronghorn; big game habitats, Rio Grande sucker & chub, New Mexico Jumping Mouse
18c. Number of rare or at-risk species tracked by state heritage programs. (For Colorado SEZs, data from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and Natural Heritage New Mexico may be used.)	10 tracked species or communities by CNHP: * Montane wet meadows * Ripley's milkvetch * Wooton milkvetch * Catseye * Rio Grande chub * Mountain plover * Silky pocket mouse * Black-footed ferret * Botta's pocket gopher * Gunnison's prairie dog	3 tracked species or communities by CNHP: * Rio Grande chub * Bald eagle * Townsend's big-eared bat	2 tracked species or communities by CNHP: * Great Plains salt meadows * Rhesus skipper							
18d. Protected species and/or critical habitat?	ESA-listed species: southwestern willow flycatcher (no designated critical habitat); BLM-sensitive species: Ripley's milkvetch, rock-loving aletes, Gunnison's prairie dog, mountain plover, western burrowing owl, big free-tailed bat, swift fox, ferruginous hawk.	ESA-listed species: none (no designated critical habitat); BLM-sensitive species: mountain plover, western burrowing owl, Gunnison's prairie dog.	ESA-listed species: none (no designated critical habitat); BLM-sensitive species: mountain plover, western burrowing owl, Gunnison's prairie dog.	BLM sensitive species (swift fox, Mtn plover, burrowing owl, migratory birds, Gunnison P-dog); eagles	BLM sensitive species - Pinyon Jay	Yes, T&E species (Southwestern Willow Flycatcher); ESA occupied habitat present; BLM special status species habitat	Probably	Migratory birds, bald/golden eagle, swift fox, Rio Grande Cutthroat & suckers, Gunnison p-dogs, burrowing owl, Mtn. Plover, Bighorn, Lynx	Yes, T&E species (Southwestern Willow flycatcher, Lynx, Yellow-billed cuckoo); ESA occupied habitat present; BLM special status species habitat	BLM sensitive species (swift fox, Mtn plover, burrowing owl, migratory birds, Gunnison's Prairie Dog); critical habitat for Southwestern Willow flycatcher, likely yellow-billed cuckoo; eagles
18e. Desert washes or ephemeral drainages?	Ephemeral drainages	Ephemeral drainages	Ephemeral drainages	yes - ephemeral drainages	Arroyo Aguaje de la Petaca Desert washes	Ephemeral drainages; playa wetlands	Ephemeral drainages	Ephemeral drainages; playa wetlands	Emergent wet meadow, Ephemeral drainages	No
18f. Cultural Resources	Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad; West Fork of the North Branch of the Old Spanish Trail; Picuris Trail; Chilli Line; Sangre de Cristo NHA	West Fork of the North Branch of the Old Spanish Trail; Sangre de Cristo NHA	Old Spanish National Historic Trail (NHT) and the West Fork of the North Branch of the Old Spanish Trail	many	Yes, Close to West Fork Old Spanish Trail;	high, Old Spanish Trail, Traditional cultural landscape; Great Sand Dunes; night sky, Sangre de Cristo NHA	Cumbres Toltec NHL scenic railroad, W. Fork Old Spanish Trail, Antonito NH Park (proposed)	Yes		Yes

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
18g. Other?				Acquisition would provide connectivity and management flexibility for the Rio Grande Natural Area, and acquisition of potential sensitive plant species habitat (Astragalus?, Rock-loving neoparyii?), and sage habitats	Provides critical pronghorn fawning habitat; mule deer migration corridor & winter range; raptor foraging habitat - migratory bird pinyon juniper-Sage obligates; Sagebrush Pollinator communication	Nationally significant wetlands, unique closed basin hydrology			Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge	Migratory bird & eagle habitat, McSimpson wetlands, Conejos river, migration corridor, riparian corridor, McIntire mansion, Pikes Stockade, Southwestern Willow flycatcher, Lynx, Yellow-billed cuckoo
19. Sources of data for the site.	Solar PEIS	Solar PEIS	Solar PEIS							
EFFECTIVENESS / ADDITIONALITY										
20. To what extent can the full spectrum of regional mitigation goals be met simultaneously? Use scale of 0 (low) to 5 (high).				3	3	5	4	4	3	3
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).				Pronghorn/big game, golden eagle, Gunnison's Prairie Dog, Burrowing owl, swift fox, hydrology, soils, environmental justice (recreation opportunities), visuals, common reserve allotment	Yes - Terrestrial big game; No to most special status species.	Yes: Migratory birds/wetland dependent species; big game habitat/terrestrial species/grassland/shrubland replacement Sensitive Species, Soils & Hydro- air & water maintenance-wetlands reduce dust, recharge aquifer; recreational opportunities/Environmental Justice (bird watching/ camping/ hunting); visuals- night sky protection/reduced development risk; protect culturally significant area.	Yes, Enhance visuals (clean up railroad corridor and mine operations), historic restoration of buildings in Antonito, state-line wildlife friendly fence	Yes: Cultural Old Historic Trail, visual, pronghorn, elk, mule deer (connectivity corridor), SS (adjacent habitat protection), Migratory Birds, Visual view (north) Soils & Hydro (provides veg cover), EJ - pinyon harvesting	Yes: Migratory Birds, wetland dependent species, special status species (adjacent habitat protection), Soils & Hydro, rec opportunities (bird watch), air & water maintenance; No: Pronghorn (connectivity corridor)	Migratory Birds/wetland dependent species, special status species, Soils & Hydro, environmental justice (recreation opportunities, bird watch/camping/hunting), air & water maintenance; water resources
21. 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).				5	5	5	2	5	4	5
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).				Replacing terrestrial habitat loss (pronghorn/big game, Sensitive Species), provide common reserve allotment for grazing loss,	For pronghorn & deer	Intactness- connects other protected areas and ACEC Restricts land use to protect migratory birds, riparian area, wetland, aquatic, big game/terrestrial species habitats, and existing Sensitive Species habitat; increased land and water availability for wildlife and aquatic habitat through land water acquisition; increased recreation activities due to increased migratory bird habitat; and conserve watershed/groundwater and air quality; protect thru acquisition and ACEC designation sensitive and significant cultural features.	Short-term uncertainty in county development plan for transfer station	Highest cultural landscape protection goal achievement among sites - Additive and consistent with BLM Healthy Lands Focal Area; alternatives including acquisitions with willing land owners. Wildlife Urban Interface development risk	Restrict land use to protect migratory birds, riparian area, wetland, aquatic, and existing SS habitat; control stream bank erosion; increased water availability for wildlife and aquatic habitat through water acquisition and application; increased recreation activities due to increased migratory bird habitat; and conserve watershed & air quality (5 for USFWS actions; 3 for actions on private property)	Expand/protect wetlands through well redrill to protect shorebirds/migratory birds
22. For mitigation on BLM-administered lands, mitigation consists of actions not eligible for Bureau or other sources of funding?				√	√	funding uncertain	√	√		√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:				Uncertainty in federal funds for land acquisition	Inadequate historic funding		Yes, Unknown or no planned funding for BLM land	Yes, Unknown or no planned funding for BLM land	Uncertainty in federal funds for augmentation water purchase - doubtful Federal funding	Uncertainty in federal funds for augmentation water purchase, land acquisition funding, well redrill funds lacking for years - doubtful Federal funding
FEASIBILITY										
23. What level of documentation is available to demonstrate effectiveness of mitigation action? Use scale of 1 (little to no documentation) to 5 (well-documented).				2	2	2	2	5	2	2

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
Score 5 for documented evidence of success; Score 1 for actions with little or no prior evidence of success.				Average documentation available	Average documentation available	Improved migratory bird and aquatic habitat through wetland development, expansion, enhancement, and protection; restoration of riparian areas; reducing grazing pressure on riparian areas; acquisition of augmentation water/instream flows/well redrill very likely to be highly effective.	Uncertain internal documents (VRI manual); 4 - ample information for supporting wildlife friendly fencing	Ethnographic documentation recent and direct; Old Spanish Trail documentation is available; unknown if additional information is available	Improved migratory bird and aquatic habitat through wetland development and protection, restoration of riparian area, and wildlife refuge management practice (search peer-reviewed or any documents to positively support this)	Average documentation available
24. 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).				3	3	2	3	3	3	4
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.				3 on average; current 2016 Land and Water Conservation Fund funds uncertain/land acquisition funds but willing sellers = 2; conservation easements = 4; all other activities contingent on acquisition of easement, common reserve = uncertain	Average: 3; 2 - Acquisition; 3 - Seasonal Closure; 3 - veg management; Restoration = 4	ACEC expansion complete; willing sellers	mitigation on public lands will be less difficult than actions on private lands	Potential DOI-BLM input on RMP Revision reallocation & other resources warranting mitigation; implementation of these potential mitigation efforts will be difficult due to varied land ownership of the area	Uncertainty with augmentation water availability; however recent success with Blanca Wetlands expansion and Monte Vista Wildlife Refuge management activities.	4 on average: well redrill, wetland restoration activities, soil erosion, wildlife friendly fence = 5; livestock trespass, uncertainty with augmentation water availability, = 3
25. Time frame needed to establish site as mitigation location (estimated years)				5 to 10	2 to 5	1 to 5	1 to 3	5 years	Augmentation Water Acquisition USFWS - 2 to 10; Private land Conservation Easement 2-5; Wetland Restoration/bird diverters on USFWS - 1-3 years	1 year
Justification:				Requires acquisition/easement	Monument Designated					Already in BLM ownership
26. Time frame for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from implementation (estimated years)				6 to 20	5 to 10	1 to 10	1 to 5	10 years	1 to 20 e.g. Insects & bird use, nesting habitat use ~3 yrs, full wetland, riparian, and aquatic habitat recovery in ~20 yrs. (assuming start at RMP amendment decision date)	1 to 5
Justification:				Requires acquisition/easement	Restoration projects					Well re-drill, restoration= 1 year; augmentation water = up to 5 years
27. Cost estimate (2015 \$) 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.				~\$1-\$8 million/land acquisition; ~100k planning new ACEC; ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, \$15/acre/year law enforcement	\$15/acre/year law enforcement, \$90/acre pinyon-juniper sage veg treatment	~\$6-10 million land/water acquisitions; \$20k-\$200k for Acquisition of augmentation water (~100-2000 acres of wetland), \$250K-2 million well re-drills; \$75K- 400K wetlands infrastructure work; ~\$50K wildlife fence work; \$15/acre/year law enforcement, \$5 acre/monitoring; \$100/acre SEZ development for cultural work	~\$15-25K/mile wildlife-friendly fence (2015 dollars); ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, ~\$15/acre/year law enforcement(Dry Lake SEZ estimate); ~\$100/cubic yard (BLM 2012 SLV contract)	Deallocation- free! Cultural mitigation 10-25K; Groundwater/acquisition s /water/ wildlife 25k+	~\$20k-\$200k for Acquisition of augmentation water ~100-2000 acres of wetland, \$75K/mile stream bank restoration, ~\$50K wildlife habitat restoration (2015 dollars); ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, \$15/acre/year law enforcement, ~\$2K-5K/acre river side conservation easement	~\$100k-\$200k for Acquisition of augmentation water ~100-2000 acres of wetland; ~\$100K well redrill; \$75K/mile stream bank restoration, ~\$75K wetland restoration; ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, \$15/acre/year law enforcement
Justification:										
Durability										
28. How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).				5	5	5	3	5	5	5

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
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 oversight would not be very durable (score of 1).				Assuming success with land acquisition and designation as ACEC	Monument	Land/water acquisition	Dump clean up depends on Transfer Station development, uncertain public compliance and success of partnership with county	Once RMP revision decision regarding solar exclusion and designation complete - funding is secured	Assuming success with water acquisition & conservation easement	Assuming success with augmentation water acquisition; designation as an ACEC
29. How durable would the mitigation be in the context of permanence of conservation and biodiversity protections? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).				4	4	5	5	5	4	4
Justification:				5= assuming land acquisition; and designation as an ACEC; 3 = erosion control features may last ~5-15 years	4 Average; 5 - acquisition; 3-sage treatment 15-20 yrs; Raptor diverters: life of ROW	Land/water acquisition; ACEC protections; withdrawn from Geothermal	Assuming secure funding, for wildlife fencing installation & maintenance	Assuming secured funding for upkeep of conservation and biodiversity elements	Assuming augmentation water funding; erosion control features may last ~5 years	5 = Assuming augmentation water funding; 4= well redrill last 30-40 years; 3 = erosion control features may last ~5-15 years
RISK										
30. 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.)				Willing sellers for land acquisition; a climate change models show higher temp. & lower precipitation (drought) in this portion of study area; long-term Oil/gas or mining leasing/development	Uncertain willing land owners; Expected increased wildfire risk; Likely reduced precipitation in 20-yr period	No current Oil/gas or mining leasing, climate change	Without a landfill (or transfer station) dumping likely to re-occur in Conejos County	DOI-BLM prioritization of SEZ solar exclusion in all SLV RMP revision NEPA alternatives; varied land ownership, cost of land and water acquisition	Water right availability; willing land owners for conservation easements; a climate change models show higher temp. & lower precipitation (draught) in this portion of study area; long-term Oil/gas or mining leasing/development, grazing on private land	Water right availability; willing sellers for water acquisition; a climate change models show higher temp. & lower precipitation (drought) in this portion of study area; long-term Oil/gas or mining leasing/development
31. To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success? Use scale of 1 (considerable) to 5 (low).				3	3	5	2	3	3	4
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 withdrawal 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).				Subdivisions located along the Rio Grande (in Costilla); and increased population could lead to increase recreation uses.	Imery Mine (Note cross-check)	Very intact landscape, surrounded by protected areas	Trash dumping will likely continue to be a high probability land-use issue; SEZ build-out affects visual mitigation success	Surrounding land uses are varied; NPS GSDNP, FWS refuges, BLACEC wetlands, promote potential mitigation success. Transmission corridors & Wildlife Urban Interface housing development represent highest mitigation success risk	Subdivisions located to the north of MVWR, home development pressure on private land within Del Norte along Rio Grande, and increased population could lead to increase recreation uses.	Subdivisions located along the Conejos and increased population could lead to increase recreation uses; however, existing closure in place (not currently enforced) to minimize effects. Also, parcels upstream and downstream under CE.
32. What is the relative probability of success? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).				4.5	4	5	4	4	5	4.5
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.				5 = Assuming funding for land acquisition; 4 = restoration projects/grazing management	Easy access - proximate access				Assuming funding for augmentation water available	5 = Assuming funding for augmentation water/well redrill; 4 = restoration projects/grazing management
33. Cumulative benefit for resources? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).				2.5	1.5	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	2.5
Justification:										

Criteria	SEZs Being Evaluated			BLM Candidate Sites						
	Antonito South East	Los Mogotes East	De Tilla Gulch	1. Brownie Hills	2. Cerro del Aire	3. Closed Basin Wetlands	4. Cumbres-Toltec	5. Fourmile Traditional Cultural Landscape	6. Limekiln Greenie	7. McIntire Simpson
PRELIMINARY SCORING: 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.	N/A	N/A	N/A	44.5	43	47	39	48	45	45.5
STAKEHOLDER OVERLAP SCORING Calculate score by summing the number of stakeholder candidate sites overlapping with BLM candidate site	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	0	1	2	0	1	1

Criteria	BLM Candidate Sites									
	8. Mogote-Conejos	9. NHA Hispano Cultural Landscapes	10. Poncha Pass	11. Rio Grande Corridor	12. Sangres Foothills	13. Taos Plateau Pronghorn Assemblage	14. Taos Plateau Big Game Migration	15. Tracy Biedell	16. Trickle Mountain - Saguache Creek	17. West Fork Old Spanish Trail
SITE CHARACTERISTICS										
1. Total area of site (acres)	25,160	378,599 (CO) 393,985 (NM)	17,335	2,406	35,342	122,473	135,184	28,832	15,306	2,730
BLM acres	25,160	42,950 (CO) 74,380 (NM)	7,353	984	2,611	88,666	102,782		15,107	5,144
Private acres		315,792 (CO) 138,635 (NM)	5,750	806	26,639	8,802	20,068		198	2,716
County Lands		7,849 (CO) 5,720 (NM)	136	114	1,057	25,005	12,334	4,039		3,707
State Trust acres		638 (CO)	244					24,793		
State Park Lands		892 (CO)								
State Wildlife Areas		4,209 (CO)	72							
NPS		3,934 (CO)								
FWS		2,335 (CO)		502						
FS		114,518 (NM)	3,781		5,034					
Tribal Lands		60,732 (NM)								
BOR										
2. For ACECs, reason for designation	BLM Wildlife Habitat Area - SS Plants (<i>Astragalus ripleyi</i>) & SS animals, scenic and visual quality	N/A	N/A	RG Corridor ACEC- protection of significant Wildlife and rec resources; San Luis Hills ACEC(Flat Tops)- big game habitats, special plant species;	N/A	Taos Plateau ACEC - scenic, water quality & quantity, wetlands, wildlife habitat, Sensitive Species (Gunnison Prairie Dog, Pinyon Jay, Townsends big-eared bat, Spotted bat, bald eagle, Western burrowing owl, Yuma skipper)	Taos Plateau ACEC - scenic, water quality & quantity, wetlands, wildlife habitat, Sensitive Species (Gunnison Prairie Dog, Pinyon Jay, Townsends big-eared bat, Spotted bat, bald eagle, Western burrowing owl, Yuma skipper)	Wildlife, Special Status Plants, Geologic formations	Provide special management to protect and enhance special wildlife values (multiple overlapping and intensive big game winter use), other significant natural values, and special status plants.	N/A
3. VRM and VRI Class			?	?		I & II	II			
Justification:										
4. Consistent with the Resource Management Plan?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:		Rio Grande Corridor	Most of this area is currently undergoing a Gunnison's Sage Grouse range-wide RMP Plan.	Land and Water Conservation Fund, Rio Grande corridor plan, RGNA plan?	Land and Water Conservation Fund Proposals	Taos RMP; Monument designation, Rio Grande Corridor Plan, Land and Water Conservation Fund	Taos RMP; Monument designation, Rio Grande Corridor Plan, Land and Water Conservation Fund	Land and Water Conservation Fund Proposals		
5. Same HUC 4 watershed?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
6. Current landscape condition score? (Using Landscape Assessment)										

Criteria	BLM Candidate Sites									
	8. Mogote-Conejos	9. NHA Hispano Cultural Landscapes	10. Poncha Pass	11. Rio Grande Corridor	12. Sangres Foothills	13. Taos Plateau Pronghorn Assemblage	14. Taos Plateau Big Game Migration	15. Tracy Biedell	16. Trickle Mountain - Saguache Creek	17. West Fork Old Spanish Trail
7. Mitigation tool (restoration/enhancement, acquisition, banking, withdrawal, special designation, etc.)	Action 1. Expand Los Mogotes ACEC during RMP revision prioritizing winterfat - grassland habitat for viable wildlife populations Action 2. Install wildlife friendly fence or remove ineffective and/or unneeded fencing Action 3. Repair &/or remove outdated, or construct new wildlife water sources; Action 4. Augment land use compliance monitoring and enforcement capabilities	Action 1. Establishment of 3rd-party administered cultural heritage area compensation fund Action 2. Map and document Spanish & Mexican era land grant hispano settlement era acequia-long lot agricultural heritage areas in the Sangre de Cristo & Northern Rio Grande NHA Land Grant era	Action 1. Install wildlife friendly fence Action 2. Develop wildlife water enhancements (i.e. stock tanks, spring enhancements) Action 3. Establish mitigation/conservation banks land acquisition/easements, Riparian and upland habitat restoration Action 4. Install fence and power line avian collision deterrents and/or buried power lines.	Action 1. Establish of conservation easement to expand existing protected grassland and shrubland habitat, or Action 2. Acquisition of lands from willing sellers bordering Rio Grande, Action 3. Augment law enforcement capabilities to increase reach of land use compliance, monitoring, Action 4. Build & maintain XX miles of enclosures Action 5. Install wildlife-friendly fencing Action 6. Acquire 0.10 cfs of Conejos river winter flows/acre of SEZ development 1. Establish instream flows 2. Stream rehabilitation/water quality/sediment/erosion projects 3. Enforcement of range allotments; 4. Conservation ROW easement/buffer of Critical Habitat; 5. Build & maintain exclosures. 6. Acquisition of Alamosa Marshes (adjacent to ANWR- 20,000 acres) 7. Acquisition of De Vargas Crossing, 8. Acquisition of Private lands bordering Rio Grande, 9. Wildlife-friendly fencing 10. Acquisition/trade of county lands.	Action 1. Enhance Old Spanish NHT Action 2. Restore Baca NWR disturbed ag circles for wildlife habitat Action 3. Replace desert shrub -grassland wildlife habitat through conservation easements or land acquisition with willing sellers or create mitigation, habitat exchange or conservation banks. Action 4 Replace or offset groundwater recharge area lost due to solar development. Action 5. Install wildlife friendly fence and wildlife water enhancements (i.e. stock tanks; spring enhancement)	Action 1. Pronghorn habitat - seasonal closure & and conservation measure enforcement (hiding) Action 2. Conservation easement and/or acquisition of non-federal wildlife and playa wetlands habitat. Action 3. Playa wetland restoration. Action 4. Shrubland - grassland vegetation - pollinator restoration/habitat enhancement activities. Action 5. Fencing to create reserve common allotments. Action 6. Fencing removal &/or modification (Wildlife friendly fencing). Action 7. Raptor friendly transmission mitigation fund. Action 8. Establish Rio Grande minimum in-stream flows	Action 1. Travel and transportation plan completion and implementation activities. Action 2. Shrubland - grassland vegetation pollinator restoration/habitat enhancement activities. Action 3. Conservation easement and/or acquisition of non-federal wildlife and playa wetlands habitat. Action 4. Playa wetland restoration. Action 5. Fencing to create reserve common allotments. Action 6. Fencing removal &/or modification (Wildlife friendly fencing). Action 7. Raptor friendly transmission mitigation fund	Action 1. Negotiate BLM State of Colorado habitat exchange/mitigation bank and stewardship agreement for pronghorn and special status species (Gunnison Prairie dog, burrowing owl, Mtn. Plover) habitat Action 2. Install wildlife friendly fence at 2.5 miles of fence removed/100 acres SEZ developed), 3 miles for big game habitat and movement improvements. Action 3. Install wildlife water enhancements (i.e. stock tanks; spring enhancement) Action 4: Augment law enforcement capabilities to increase Travel Management Plan compliance. Action 5 Rehabilitate TMP- unauthorized routes (rip/reseed), and install erosion control structures.	Action 1. Install wildlife friendly fence at 2.5 miles of fence removed/100 acres SEZ developed), 3 miles/100 acres SEZ for big game habitat and movement improvements. Action 2. Construct wildlife water enhancements/spring developments. Action 3. Augment law enforcement capabilities to increase Travel Management Plan compliance. Action 4 Rehabilitate TMP- unauthorized routes (rip/reseed), and install erosion control structures. Action 5. Old Spanish Trail.NHT enhancement measure and Cultural landscape protections/enhancements Action 6. Augment land use compliance monitoring and enforcement capabilities. Action 7. Increased LEO presence (cultural site protection,) Action 8. OHV off road prevention	Action 1. Identify record and evaluate section of the W. Fork Old Spanish Trail \ and establish cultural and ecological mitigation bank(s). Action 2. Wildlife forage bank; Install wildlife friendly fence at or Remove fencing or Install wildlife friendly fence. Action 3 Develop wildlife water enhancements (i.e. stock tanks, spring enhancements) Action 4. Ground water recharge and protection (purchase water rights, manage disturbance in recharge areas). Action 5. Shorebird-wetland attraction and development.
Justification:										
8. In SEZ Ecoregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
9. In SEZ ecological subregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
10. If applicable, meets priorities for ESA critical habitat?	X	X	X	√	X	X	X	X	X	X
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:				Southwestern Willow Flycatcher						
11. Mitigates for all or most identified residual impacts that warrant regional mitigation?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	W. Fork Old Spanish Trail, Pronghorn, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Visual, Sensitive Species, Raptor, Mtn Plover, Swift Fox, Hot Creek	E. Fork Old Spanish Trail, Pronghorn, Big Game Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Visual, Sensitive Species, Raptor, Mtn Plover, Swift Fox, Shorebirds, Waterbirds	Pronghorn, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Bats, Visual, Sensitive Species, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, Migratory birds, hydrology, soils	Hydrology, Soils, Sensitive Species, Pronghorn, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Visual, Raptor, Mtn Plover, Swift Fox, Potentially Eligible Cultural Features, shorebirds/waterbirds	Wetlands, Grassland, Pronghorn, Bats, GRSA, ACEC, Refuge, Sensitive Species, T&E, Visual, E. Fork Old Spanish Trail	Big game, Pronghorn, Gunnison Prairie Dog-Burrowing Owl-Swift Fox, wildlife Corridor, connectivity, Pollinators, Visual, Raptor, Mtn Plover, Swift Fox, Eligible and potentially Eligible Cultural Features, shorebirds/waterbirds, hydrology, soils, Sensitive Species	Big game, Pronghorn, Gunnison Prairie Dog-Burrowing Owl-Swift Fox, wildlife Corridor, connectivity, Pollinators, Visual, Raptor, Mtn Plover, Swift Fox, Eligible and potentially Eligible Cultural Features, shorebirds/waterbirds, hydrology, soils, Sensitive Species	W. Fork Old Spanish Trail, Pronghorn, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Bats, Visual, Sensitive Species, RNA, raptor & migratory birds	Pronghorn, Mule deer, elk, BHS, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Bats, Visual, E. Fork Old Spanish Trail, Sensitive Species	Pronghorn, Mule deer, elk, BHS, Migration Corridor, Connectivity, Bats, Visual, W. Fork Old Spanish Trail, Sensitive Species
12. Similar landscape value, ecological functionality, biological value, species, habitat types, and/or natural features?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

Criteria	BLM Candidate Sites									
	8. Mogote-Conejos	9. NHA Hispano Cultural Landscapes	10. Poncha Pass	11. Rio Grande Corridor	12. Sangres Foothills	13. Taos Plateau Pronghorn Assemblage	14. Taos Plateau Big Game Migration	15. Tracy Biedell	16. Trickle Mountain - Saguache Creek	17. West Fork Old Spanish Trail
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); depending on whether site includes resources critical to meet mitigation objectives. Justification:										Old Spanish Trail visual impacts mitigation, potential protection and enhancement of habitat.
13. Dominant vegetation, condition, and acres	?	?	?	?	?			?	See Vegetation Departure score for parcels selected	
Justification:										
14. Provides adequate geographic extent?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes, X for No. depending on whether site provides area for mitigation at least as large as the entire developable area of the SEZ.										
15. Feasibility of action?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:										
16. Links two or more protected areas?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	2 SWA's; 1 FWS Refuge; 3 BLM ACEC's; State Stewardship Trust; 1 FS Research Natural Area	FWS Sangre de Cristo Conservation Easement - Rio Grande NA	√ Conservation easements, National Forest Wilderness/Backcountry	Links Rio Grande, Upland habitat, RGNA- The Monument- State Historical Site-Alamosa NWR, ACEC's (2), WSA.	NPS, FWS Refuge, BLM ACEC. State Park, FS Special Interest Area (SIA); BLM SRMA; TNC easement	Links Rio Grande del Norte National Monument, including Audubon Important Bird Area to the Rio Grande Natural Area	Links Cumbres Toltec NHL - Rio San Antonio WSA - Rio Grande del Norte National Monument, including Audubon Important Bird Area - Rio Grande Natural Area - Northern Rio Grande NHA - Sangre de Cristo NHA - Rio Grande Wild & Scenic River - Urraca State Wildlife Area	Trickle Mountain ACEC, State Stewardship Trust, Research Natural Area, Penetinte Canyon SRMA	Connectivity La Garita Range, Saguache Creek, Ute Hills	Beidel Archaeological District, Trickle Mountain ACEC, State Stewardship Trust, Research Natural Area, Penetinte Canyon SRMA
17. Site and its proposed actions meet regional conservation/ mitigation goals and objectives?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:						√ Provides ecology-vegetation, cultural resources, visual, dust abatement, pronghorn and big game habitat, Gunnison's Prairie Dog, burrowing owl habitat, Environmental Justice	√ Provides ecology-vegetation, cultural resources, visual, dust abatement, big game habitat, Gunnison's Prairie Dog, burrowing habitat, Environmental Justice			
18. 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 18a through 18f.)										
18a. Perennial, protected sources of water?	Alamosa River	Sangres drainages, Artisan Wells/Springs, Big Springs	San Luis, Alder, Decker, Raspberry, Dorsey, Black canyon, Kerber Creeks	Rio Grande River	San Isabel Creek,	Rio Grande River	Rio Grande River	Saguache Creek, La Garita Creek, Carnero Creek	Saguache Creek? GIS	Yes - Saguache Creek, La Garita Creek, Carnero Creek
18b. Unique species assemblages?	7 BLM special status species occur; State Endangered Species	Shorebirds- Waterbirds; Rio Grande Corridor Ecosystem	BLM SS occur, habitat connectivity between San Juan, Sangre de Cristos, and Saguache mtn. ranges. Sagebrush species assemblage, aspen species transition zone into montane and alpine zone species assemblage	Southwestern willow flycatcher, yellow billed cuckoo habitat, Migratory bird assemblage; bighorn sheep; golden eagle, bald eagle, otter; riparian species assemblage, pronghorn; big game habitats; Rio Grande sucker & chub, New Mexico Jumping Mouse	BLM SS occur, habitat connectivity, big game pronghorn corridor; shorebirds-waterbirds; Sand Dunes Ecosystem	Ferruginous hawk; Mtn Plover, Burrowing Owl, Gunnison's Prairie Dog, Swift Fox, River Otter	Ferruginous hawk; Mtn Plover, Burrowing Owl, Gunnison's Prairie Dog, Swift Fox, River Otter, Yuma skipper, Pinyon Jay	Neoparrya	Lynx	Pinyon Juniper Sagebrush, Golden Eagle/Raptors, Neoparrya

Criteria	BLM Candidate Sites									
	8. Mogote-Conejos	9. NHA Hispano Cultural Landscapes	10. Poncha Pass	11. Rio Grande Corridor	12. Sangres Foothills	13. Taos Plateau Pronghorn Assemblage	14. Taos Plateau Big Game Migration	15. Tracy Biedell	16. Trickle Mountain - Saguache Creek	17. West Fork Old Spanish Trail
18c. Number of rare or at-risk species tracked by state heritage programs. (For Colorado SEZs, data from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and Natural Heritage New Mexico may be used.)										
18d. Protected species and/or critical habitat?	Yes, T&E species (Southwest willow flycatcher, Lynx, Yellow-billed cuckoo); ESA occupied habitat present; BLM Sensitive Species habitat	Unknown	Yes, Mtn Plover, Mexican Free-tail bats, Gunnison prairie dog, T&E species (Gunnison's sage grouse occupied habitat, lynx linkage, potential Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat, potential MSO),	BLM sensitive species (swift fox, Mtn plover, burrowing owl, migratory birds, Gunnison Prairie dog); critical habitat for Southwestern willow flycatcher, likely Yellow billed cuckoo; eagles	Yes, BLM sensitive species (Gunnison's Prairie Dog, Mtn Plover, Mexican Free-tail bats)	BLM sensitive species (swift fox, Mtn plover, burrowing owl, migratory birds, Gunnison Prairie dog); critical habitat for Southwestern willow flycatcher, likely Yellow billed cuckoo; eagles; Rio Grande Chub & Sucker	BLM sensitive species (swift fox, Mtn plover, burrowing owl, migratory birds, Gunnison Prairie dog); critical habitat for Southwest Willow flycatcher, likely yellow billed cuckoo; eagles; Rio Grande Chub & Sucker		Yes, T&E Species (possibly Mtn Plover)	BLM sensitive species (Mtn plover, burrowing owl, migratory birds, Gunnison Prairie dog); eagles
18e. Desert washes or ephemeral drainages?	Ephemeral drainages; playa wetlands	Desert washes and ephemeral playas	Ephemeral drainages	Yes- side channels	Ephemeral drainages; playa wetlands	Numerous ephemeral playas	Ephemeral playas	Ephemeral drainages; playa wetlands	Ephemeral Drainages	Yes
18f. Cultural Resources	Sangre de Cristo NHA, SWA, Hot Creek, Cumbres Toltec, W.Fork Old Spanish Trail; Astragalus population area	Yes, Sangre de Cristo NHA & Conservation Area, SWA, E.Fork Old Spanish Trail		many, south of Lobatos bridge-petroglyphs, old dam- cultural	Yes, Old Spanish Trail, Traditional cultural landscape; Great Sand Dunes; night sky, Sangre de Cristo NHA	Yes, Close to West Fork Old Spanish Trail;	Yes, Close to West Fork Old Spanish Trail;	Old Spanish Trail, Traditional cultural landscape, Penitente Canyon SRMA, ACEC	Old Spanish Trail, High density cultural resources - Ute Signature	Yes, West Fork Old Spanish Trail, Beidel Archaeological District, SRMA, ACEC
18g. Other?			Pronghorn corridor, Bat colony forage area, Gunnison P-dog active colonies, Mtn Plover flyways, Migratory bird flyways, Big game migration corridor, Gunnison's sage grouse occupied habitat, Lynx linkage area	RGNA, Alamosa NWR, Astragalus?, Rock-loving neoparyii, migration corridor, riparian corridor, Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat, Yellow billed cuckoo habitat	Baca National Wildlife Refuge, significant wetlands	Provides pronghorn assemblage habitat; Mule deer migration corridor & winter range; Raptor foraging habitat - migratory bird Pinyon Juniper Sage obligates; Sagebrush Pollinator communication	Provides winter range, big game hiding and thermal cover habitat; Raptor foraging habitat - migratory bird Pinyon Juniper Sage obligates; Sagebrush Pollinator communication			
19. Sources of data for the site.		Arnie Valdez								
EFFECTIVENESS / ADDITIONALITY										
20. To what extent can the full spectrum of regional mitigation goals be met simultaneously? Use scale of 0 (low) to 5 (high).	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
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).	Yes: Pronghorn, elk, mule deer (connectivity corridor), SS (adjacent habitat protection), Migratory Birds, Visual view (north) Soils & Hydro (provides veg cover), EJ (grazing, rec opportunities, air & water maintenance); No: wetland dependent species	2 - Overall; 5 - NHA values - Sangre de Cristo & Northern Rio Grande National Heritage - 1 other resource values & functions	Fences could be removed and modified to aid big game migration, water improvement projects could provide habitat to migratory birds, Actions enhance and restore but don't fully replace habitat loss	Migratory Birds/wetland dependent species, pronghorn/big game SS, Soils & Hydro, rec opportunities (bird watch/camping), air & water maintenance; some Pronghorn habitat/water resources; visuals?; Environmental Justice?	Yes: Cultural OHT), visual, pronghorn, elk, mule deer (connectivity corridor), SS (adjacent habitat protection), Migratory Birds, Visual view (north) Soils & Hydro (provides veg cover), Environmental Justice - pinyon harvesting	Pronghorn/big game, golden eagle, Gunnison's Prairie dog, Burrowing owl, swift fox, Migratory Birds/wetland dependent species, Soils & Hydro, rec opportunities (bird watch/camping), air & water maintenance; some Pronghorn habitat/water resources; visuals; Env. Justice	Pronghorn/big game, golden eagle, Gunnison's Prairie dog, Burrowing owl, swift fox, Migratory Birds/wetland dependent species, Soils & Hydro, rec opportunities (bird watch/camping), air & water maintenance; some Pronghorn habitat/water resources; visuals; Env. Justice	Pronghorn & big game habitat, SS habitat (Gunnison's Prairie dog, Burrowing owl, Mtn plover), West Fork Old Spanish Trail, Visual resources VRM class 2, distant to Conejos County EJ, uncertain replacement for wetlands migratory bird due to distance.	Yes: Pronghorn, elk, mule deer (connectivity corridor), SS (adjacent habitat protection), Migratory Birds, Visual view (north) Soils & Hydro (provides veg cover), EJ (grazing, rec opportunities, air & water maintenance); No: wetland dependent species	W Fork Old Spanish Trail and Wildlife mitigation
21. 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).	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	3	4

Criteria	BLM Candidate Sites									
	8. Mogote-Conejos	9. NHA Hispano Cultural Landscapes	10. Poncha Pass	11. Rio Grande Corridor	12. Sangres Foothills	13. Taos Plateau Pronghorn Assemblage	14. Taos Plateau Big Game Migration	15. Tracy Biedell	16. Trickle Mountain - Saguache Creek	17. West Fork Old Spanish Trail
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).	ACEC expansion could provide long-term protections for pronghorn, BLM Sensitive Species, upland views to resource values impacted by Los Mogotes SEZ; Additional modification of fences would aid big game movement, water improvement projects would mitigate impacts to migratory birds.	Mitigation site and action responds to special designated area and NHA cultural heritage values, but not necessarily ecosystem intactness or species conservation goals	Removal or modification of fences would aid big game migration, water improvement projects would mitigate impacts to migratory birds	Expand/protect riparian corridor to protect shorebirds/migratory birds, and aquatic habitats, enhance existing SS habitat; control stream bank erosion; increased water availability for wildlife and aquatic habitat through water acquisition (augmentation and instream flows); increased recreation activities due to increased migratory bird habitat/land trade with county for campsite development; and conserve watershed & air quality.	Additive and consistent with BLM Healthy Lands Focal Area; Alternatives including willing land owners. Wildland Urban Interface development risk	Replacing terrestrial habitat loss (pronghorn/big game, sensitive species), provide common reserve allotment for grazing loss	Replacing terrestrial habitat loss (pronghorn/big game, SS), provide common reserve allotment for grazing loss	Large land acreage and continuous habitat linking pronghorn and big game from uplands to lower elevations	Veg health, restrict land uses that protect visual resources, retain & conserve existing SS habitat, protecting pronghorn movement corridors, maintain long-held grazing use, conserve watershed & air quality (Environmental Justice)	W Fork Old Spanish Trail and Wildlife mitigation
22. For mitigation on BLM-administered lands, mitigation consists of actions not eligible for Bureau or other sources of funding?	√	Non-federal lands	√	√	Limited BLM lands	√	√	N/A	√	funding uncertain
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	Yes, Unknown or no planned funding for BLM land		Yes, Unknown or no planned funding for BLM land	Uncertainty in federal funds for augmentation water purchase, land acquisition funding, well redrill funds lacking for years - doubtful Federal funding		Uncertainty in federal funds for land acquisition funding	Uncertainty in federal funds for land acquisition funding		Yes, Unknown or no planned funding for BLM land	
FEASIBILITY										
23. What level of documentation is available to demonstrate effectiveness of mitigation action? Use scale of 1 (little to no documentation) to 5 (well-documented).	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Score 5 for documented evidence of success; Score 1 for actions with little or no prior evidence of success.	Average documentation available	See Library of Congress documentation of NM acequia-long lot systems for La Cienega NM (A.Valdez, 2013?)	uncertain internal documents (VRI manual); 4 - ample information for supporting wildlife friendly fencing	Average documentation available	Average documentation available	Average documentation available	Average documentation available	Average documentation available	improved range management practice for improved rangelands, documented trend studies for area. (?)	Some minor documentation of the West Fork Old Spanish Trail
24. 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).	3	5	4	3	2	3	3	2	3	3
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.	BLM-NEPA FLPMA land use allocation decision; Some complication defining compatible uses for expanded ACEC values	Assuming SHPO, NPS, NHA & academic support and engagement	The majority of the sites are on federal lands. There would likely be public support for water improvement projects on private lands. With proper funding, fence conversions could likely occur on private lands.	3 on average: riparian restoration activities, soil erosion = 5; wildlife friendly fence enclosures = 3; uncertainty with establishing instream flows/county land trade, livestock trespass = 2	unknown and uncertain private land owner interest for easement or acquisition	3 on average; Travel management plan = 2; Restoration = 4; current 2016 LWCF funds uncertain/land acquisition funds but willing sellers = 2; conservation easements = 4; all other activities contingent on acquisition of easement; 3 common reserve = uncertain	3 on average; Travel management plan = 2; Restoration = 4; on average; current 2016 LWCF funds uncertain/land acquisition funds but willing sellers = 2; conservation easements = 4; all other activities contingent on acquisition of easement, common reserve = uncertain	Some difficulty based on uncertainty in State priority and future stewardship agreement status between BLM, State Land Board and National Park Service. Colorado State Land Board proposes to remove these lands from the Stewardship Agreement on State lands,	Mitigation on public lands will be less difficult than actions on private lands	Some difficulty based on uncertainty in State priority and future stewardship agreement status between BLM, State Land Board and National Park Service. Colorado State Land Board proposes to remove these
25. Time frame needed to establish site as mitigation location (estimated years)	1 to 5	1 to 3	1 to 3	1 year	5 to 10	2 to 5	2 to 5	2 to 5	1 to 5	1 to 5

Criteria	BLM Candidate Sites									
	8. Mogote-Conejos	9. NHA Hispano Cultural Landscapes	10. Poncha Pass	11. Rio Grande Corridor	12. Sangres Foothills	13. Taos Plateau Pronghorn Assemblage	14. Taos Plateau Big Game Migration	15. Tracy Biedell	16. Trickle Mountain - Saguache Creek	17. West Fork Old Spanish Trail
Justification:				Already RGNA		Monument Designated	Monument Designated	BLM & State Land negotiations		
26. Time frame for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from implementation (estimated years)	2 to 10	1 to 5	1 to 5	1 to 20	1 to 5	1-2 yrs wildlife friendly fencing; 3-5 yrs land acquisitions; 5 to 10, restoration projects	3-5 yrs land acquisitions; 5 to 10; restoration projects	1 to 5	1 to 10	5 years
Justification:				1=restoration/enclosures; 20= instream flows/county land trade				Existing pronghorn & SS habitat,		
27. Cost estimate (2015 \$) 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.	~NEPA-RMP revision costs	Consult Arnie Valdez for NM mapping costs	~\$15-25K/mile wildlife-friendly fence (2015 dollars); ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, ~\$15/acre/year law enforcement(Dry Lake SEZ estimate); \$10,000/acre wetland restoration	~100K- 800K instream flow acquisition (5-15cfs); \$75K/mile streambank restoration, ~\$80K enclosures; ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, \$15/acre/year law enforcement	~ estimated easement or acquisition costs = \$600-3000/acre (2015 US\$); \$15-25K/mile wildlife-friendly fence (2015 dollars); ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, ~\$15/acre/year law enforcement(Dry Lake SEZ estimate)	~\$1-\$8 million/land acquisition; ~\$350k Travel Management planning; ~\$20-30/acre/year monitoring, \$15/acre/year law enforcement ; BLM NEPA cost for mitigation actions ~\$50K, ~\$3 -5K for water catchment maintenance/unit (labor/materials), ~\$15-25K for wildlife friendly fencing for forage banks (i.e. full section/640 acres = 4 linear miles @ ~\$60K to 100K for 1 section forage bank), ~\$15/acre/year law enforcement	~\$1-\$8 million/land acquisition; ~\$350k Travel Management planning; ~\$20-30/acre/year monitoring, \$15/acre/year law enforcement ; BLM NEPA cost for mitigation actions ~\$50K, ~\$3 -5K for water catchment maintenance/unit (labor/materials), ~\$15-25K for wildlife friendly fencing for forage banks (i.e. full section/640 acres = 4 linear miles @ ~\$60K to 100K for 1 section forage bank), ~\$15/acre/year law enforcement	BLM NEPA cost for mitigation actions ~\$50K, ~\$8 -10K for Stock tank development (labor/materials), ~\$15-25K for wildlife friendly fencing for forage banks (i.e. full section/640 acres = 4 linear miles @ ~\$60K to 100K for 1 section forage bank), ~\$8-10K for spring development; ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, ~\$15/acre/year law enforcement	~\$15-25K/mile wildlife-friendly fence (2015 dollars); ~\$5/acre/year monitoring, ~\$15/acre/year law enforcement (Dry Lake SEZ estimate)	\$30 - 50K
Justification:										
Durability										
28. How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	4	5	2	5	4	5	5	5	4	4
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 oversight would not be very durable (score of 1).	Assuming secure implementation action funding, for wildlife friendly fencing & water development installation & maintenance	Assuming academic and student involvement, long-term & permanent knowledge base development	Assuming secure funding, for wildlife fencing installation & maintenance but no congressional action or land use plan designation; no formal protection defined	Assuming success with instream flows (federal right)	Assuming secure funding, for land acquisition or easement; wildlife fencing installation & maintenance but no congressional action or land use plan designation; no formal protection defined	Monument	Monument	Assuming legally binding agreement with State Land Board for duration of SEZ impact, unknown time frame for native plant recovery	Assuming secure funding, for wildlife fencing installation & maintenance but no congressional action or land use plan designation; no formal protection defined	Multiple existing protections
29. How durable would the mitigation be in the context of permanence of conservation and biodiversity protections? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	3	4
Justification:	Assuming ACEC expansion and secure funding, required maintenance for wildlife fencing following installation	Cultural resource documentation could expand national understanding of Spanish and Mexican era hispano settlement patterns in two NHA's	Assuming secure funding, required maintenance for wildlife fencing following installation	5 = Assuming instream flow acquisition; 3 =erosion control features may last ~5-15 years	Assuming land acquisition or easement and secure funding, required maintenance for wildlife fencing following installation	5= assuming land acquisition & Travel Plan completion; 3 = water catchment features may ~3 years; Fence maintenance ~10-15 yrs	5= assuming land acquisition & Travel Plan completion; 3 = water catchment features may ~3 years; Fence maintenance ~10-15 yrs	Assuming legally binding agreement with State Land Board for duration of SEZ impact (~50 to 75 years native plant recovery - double check with Ecologist)	Assuming secure funding, required maintenance for wildlife fencing following installation	Existing protections

Criteria	BLM Candidate Sites									
	8. Mogote-Conejos	9. NHA Hispano Cultural Landscapes	10. Poncha Pass	11. Rio Grande Corridor	12. Sangres Foothills	13. Taos Plateau Pronghorn Assemblage	14. Taos Plateau Big Game Migration	15. Tracy Biedell	16. Trickle Mountain - Saguache Creek	17. West Fork Old Spanish Trail
RISK										
30. 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.)	Social acceptance in Conejos County and affected grazing permittees for expanded ACEC area designated for pronghorn and SS protections	Understanding of pre-American period land use patterns and cultural landscape characteristics	Limited to no constraints for wildlife friendly fencing; some complexity with fence removal; transmission line burials very complex. Higher rural home development risk proximate to Salida	Water availability for instream flow; willing sellers for water acquisition; a climate change models show higher temp. & lower precipitation (drought) in this portion of study area; long-term Oil/gas or mining leasing/development	Land owner interest; geothermal, leasable, and/or fluid mineral interest	Hunting-access-road use; Willing sellers for land acquisition; a climate change models show higher temp. & lower precipitation (drought) in this portion of study area	Hunting-access-road use; Willing sellers for land acquisition; a climate change models show higher temp. & lower precipitation (drought) in this portion of study area	Priorities and Procedural constraints with State Land Board, effective level of grazing management	No current Oil/gas or mining leasing, limited OHV issues, moderate grazing compliance, climate change models show higher temp. & lower precipitation in this portion of study area	Priorities and Procedural constraints with State Land Board, effective level of grazing management
31. To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success? Use scale of 1 (considerable) to 5 (low).	3	1	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	4
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 withdrawal 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).	SEZ build-out affects visual mitigation success	Rapid land use change alters 150-400 yr old subsistence agricultural land cover features	Increased population could lead to increase recreation uses and potential increase in rural residential development including fencing	Subdivisions located along the Rio Grande (in Costilla County); and increased population could lead to increase recreation uses.	Unique Baca National Wildlife Refuge reverse split estate; Moderate-high Wildlife Urban Interface development risk, existing fluid mineral interest riaks, along San Isabel Creek to County Rd T	Private Inholdings - Wildlife Urban Interface I - National	Adjacent property owners - land users - Private Inholdings - Wildlife Urban Interface - National	Active mining and potential mining expansion in area, if public and State land grazing is not meeting land health standards	One polygon for mitigation is adjacent to SEZ development & would impact mitigation success, subdivisions located to the north, home development pressure on private land, increased population could lead to increase in recreation uses	Beidel district will be enhanced by Old Spanish Trail evaluation and additional protection for pronghorn and other big game species
32. What is the relative probability of success? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	4	5	4		2	5	5	4	4	5
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.	Assuming Conejos County interest and acceptance	Assuming NHA & SHPO interest + local subject matter expertise and leadership	Fences would be converted/modified/maintained, riparian habitat could be modified for increased use by migratory birds	5 = Assuming funding for instream flows; 4 = restoration projects; 2= grazing management	High uncertainty-majority non-federal actions	Most intact - least adjacent property owners	Most intact - least adjacent property owners	Assuming BLM and State Land long-term agreement	Assuming BLM and State Land long-term agreement	Easily implemented assuming funding and long term State-BLM agreement.
33. Cumulative benefit for resources? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	4	3	3.5	1.5	4	3.5
Justification:										
PRELIMINARY SCORING 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.	40	42	38	46.6	36	45	45	43	38	44
STAKEHOLDER OVERLAP SCORING Calculate score by summing the number of stakeholder candidate sites overlapping with BLM candidate site	5	0	4	5	2	1	0	2	3	3

Criteria	TWS Candidate Sites		Defenders of Wildlife Candidate Sites							Ecosystem Council Candidate Sites			
	Rio Grande	Los Mogote	Twin Lakes	S. San Luis Hills	Los Mogotes	Triangle	Findlay Gulch	Mineral Springs	Elephant Rocks	Blanca Wetlands Expansion & Restoration	Rio Grande Natural Area	Poncha Pass/ Sage Grouse	Penitente Canyon and Elephant Rocks
SITE CHARACTERISTICS													
1. Total area of site (acres)	68,687	78,965	5,709	7,605	6,292	2,717	5,144	5,361	4,204				
BLM acres	68,687	78,965	5,709	7,605	6,292	2,717	5,144	5,361	4,204				
private acres			0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
State Trust acres			0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
FWS													
USFS (Rio Grande Nat'l Forest)													
CDOW													
Land trust													
			We limited our analysis to identifying candidate sites on BLM lands. This was based on the recognition that efforts to compensate for impacts on BLM lands should occur preferentially within BLM lands where high viability areas exist. We did not identify additional mitigation sites that may meet similar mitigation objectives on non-BLM lands.										
2. For ACECs, reason for designation	√	√	Our analysis excluded ACECs designated for wildlife as potential as candidate sites for mitigation							Contain or next to ACEC's	Contain or next to ACEC's		
<i>Justification:</i>	The Rio Grande Mitigation Site encompasses the San Luis Hills ACEC, which was designated to "maintain and, if possible, improve condition on the existing acres of Flat Top Mountain wetlands, big game, habitat, and special status plant values." It also encompasses the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC, which was designated to protect its natural, scenic, recreational and wildlife values.	The Los Mogotes East Mitigation Site encompasses the Ra Jadero Canyon ACEC, which was designated to "provide special management to protect special status plant values and other significant values." It also encompasses the Los Mogotes East ACEC, which was designated to "protect and enhance big game crucial winter habitat, birthing habitat, and special status plant values. The broader Antonito Southeast and Los Mogotes East Mitigation Sites also include these resources and values, as detailed on pp. 7-16 of the TWS comments and in Attachment 4.	Our analysis focused on identifying new lands where the implementation of additional investments would be likely to be effective in offsetting impacts from solar development in the SEZs, with appropriate protections and management. We considered areas already protected by ACEC designations for wildlife to be lower priorities as candidate mitigation sites due to uncertainty regarding the additive value of mitigation investments in these areas.										
3. VRM and VRI Class	VRM - II and III	VRM - III and IV	IV	III	III	IV	II-III	II	II-III				
<i>Justification:</i>			While this criterion does not appear to influence the overall site score, we do not see how improvements to a site with a higher VRM class necessarily correspond to compensation for adverse impacts to non-visual resources at the SEZ, particularly for impacts to wildlife. As with ACEC designations, it is difficult to ascertain whether off-site improvements to candidate sites with a higher VRM class would confer additive value. (Also, it is difficult to interpret what is meant by a "higher VRM class" in the Notes, presumably Class I is "higher" than Class II).							All our candidate sites have strong visual resources, along with the SEZ's so that is difficult to quantify, but Blanca Wetlands, Rio Grande Natural Area and Poncha Pass Sage Grouse habitat have expansive visual characteristics.			
4. Consistent with the Resource Management Plan?	√	√	Factor not evaluated							√	√	√	√
<i>√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:</i>	As described above, the mitigation sites are consistent with the RMP in regards to ACEC goals and objectives. Protection in mitigation sites supports RMP resource condition objectives (RCOs) for the entire planning area. For example, protection supports maintaining good to excellent range condition for vegetation. As stated in the RMP, specific emphasis will be to enhance dispersed recreation opportunities, wildlife habitats, and related values (e.g., riparian, recreation). The mitigation sites do propose changing some existing RMP decisions by adding new protective designations and management to the mitigation sites, but protective designations and management in these areas is not inconsistent with BLM's goals and objectives in the RMP and in the SRMS. See pp. 7-16 of the TWS comments and Attachment 4 for more details.		This criterion applies to the <u>actions</u> taken at a site rather than the site itself. It would be more appropriate to prioritize candidate mitigation sites where proposed actions <i>align with mitigation objectives</i> drawn from the RMP goals and objectives. Unfortunately, mitigation objectives appropriate for offsetting SEZ development have not yet been determined, making it impossible to score this factor appropriately.										
5. Same HUC 4 watershed?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	NEED	√	NEED	NEED
<i>√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:</i>													
6. Current landscape condition score? (Using Landscape Assessment)	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED				

Criteria	TWS Candidate Sites		Defenders of Wildlife Candidate Sites							Ecosystem Council Candidate Sites			
	Rio Grande	Los Mogote	Twin Lakes	S. San Luis Hills	Los Mogotes	Triangle	Findlay Gulch	Mineral Springs	Elephant Rocks	Blanca Wetlands Expansion & Restoration	Rio Grande Natural Area	Poncha Pass/ Sage Grouse	Penitente Canyon and Elephant Rocks
7. Mitigation tool (restoration/enhancement, acquisition, banking, withdrawal, special designation, etc.)	Special designation/protective management; investment of mitigation funds on management and restoration in protected areas. See TWS comments pp. 7-16 for more details.	Special designation/protective management; investment of mitigation funds on management and restoration in protected areas. See TWS comments pp. 7-16 for more details.	Wild horse removal, changes in grazing, plague mitigation, playa restoration, shrub steppe restoration	Wild horse removal, changes in grazing, plague mitigation, playa restoration, shrub steppe restoration	Conservation designation, fence removal, invasive species management, shrub steppe restoration	Changes in grazing, conifer removal, vegetation management to promote connectivity	Conservation designation, changes in grazing, weed control, pronghorn and GUPD habitat management	Pronghorn and GUPD habitat & connectivity mgt., weed and conifer control, shrub steppe and riparian restoration	Changes in grazing, weed management, protection from adjacent rec. use, shrub-steppe habitat restoration	Restoration, Enhancement and acquisition	Special Designation	Special Designation	Critical upgrade of enforcement and monitoring
Justification:			The mitigation tools proposed for implementation at the candidate mitigation site should compensate for adverse impacts due to development on the SEZ. This factor should follow--rather than precede-- the identification of adverse impacts for which mitigation is required in the table.										
8. In SEZ Ecoregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	Listed in the same EPA Level III Ecoregion (22. Arizona-New Mexico Plateau)	Listed in the same EPA Level III Ecoregion (22. Arizona-New Mexico Plateau)	This factor is one of the criteria for selecting potential mitigation sites identified in our letter.										
9. In SEZ ecological subregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	San Luis Shrubland and Hills	San Luis Shrubland and Hills	BLM should define this term for users, we have assumed it to refer to the ecological subregion in which the SEZs occur. In this case all of the candidate mitigation sites occur in the Northern Rio Grande Basin subregion of the AZ/NM Plateau. Locating mitigation sites within the same subregion of the SEZ is one of the criteria for selecting potential mitigation sites identified in our letter.										
10. If applicable, meets priorities for ESA critical habitat?	√	X	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	√	√	√	X
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	Protective management of the Rio Grande Mitigation Site would support management for ESA species including Southwestern Willow Flycatcher.		The scoring system should differentiate between factors that contribute to mitigation objectives (i.e., those that compensate for adverse impacts resulting from SEZ development) and factors that provide additional conservation value to a site. These additional conservation values increase the relative value of a mitigation site <i>provided the site meets mitigation objectives</i> . Our analysis focused on identifying candidate sites to address particular mitigation objectives for the wildlife impacts identified in row 16. We did not assess the candidate sites for the presence of critical habitat since there were no known direct impacts on critical habitat in the SEZs.										
11. Mitigates for all or most identified residual impacts that warrant regional mitigation?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	The Los Mogotes and Rio Grande Mitigation Sites have resource conditions that are either similar or exceed the resources warranting mitigation identified by BLM. However, we also note that the impacts for hydrology are largely dependent on project-level design, as noted by BLM. The recommended mitigation area offers substantial opportunity to tailor mitigation strategies to address impacts posed by development in both SEZs. See pp. 7-16 of the TWS comments and Attachment 4 for more details.		The instructions should clarify how the notes column should be filled out. Each candidate site provides mitigation opportunities for impacts to multiple resources, but differ in which resources they have the potential to address. Furthermore, the SEZs differ in terms of the resources that are adversely affected by development. Some of the factors appear to link particular candidate sites to compensation for impacts at particular SEZs (e.g., factor 12 in line 19) whereas other factors, such as this one, appear to rate sites based on whether they have the potential to address any impacted resource in any SEZ.										
12. Similar landscape value, ecological functionality, biological value, species, habitat types, and/or natural features?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); depending on whether site includes resources critical to meet mitigation objectives. Justification:	Recommended mitigation sites represent an equivalent or increase in resource values currently present in the Antonito Southeast and Los Mogotes East SEZs. See pp. 7-16 of the TWS comments and Attachment 4 for more details.		The matrix should also identify which values will be adversely impacted in the SEZ so that candidate mitigation sites can be evaluated based on their capacity to contribute to corresponding mitigation objectives. Mitigation objectives should be specified in order to score this factor appropriately.										
13. Dominant vegetation, condition, and acres	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED				
Justification:	Yes. LANDFIRE index and ecological condition value derived from REA data denotes mod-high integrity in mitigation areas.		It is not clear what should be entered for this factor. The type of dominant vegetation community at the candidate mitigation site? The amount of the dominant vegetation community in "medium to high integrity" at the candidate mitigation site? If the factor is intended to ensure that the candidate mitigation site can compensate for adverse impacts to the intactness of the dominant vegetation type at the SEZ, then the factor should also be described for each of the SEZs.										
14. Provides adequate geographic extent?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

Criteria	TWS Candidate Sites		Defenders of Wildlife Candidate Sites							Ecosystem Council Candidate Sites			
	Rio Grande	Los Mogote	Twin Lakes	S. San Luis Hills	Los Mogotes	Triangle	Findlay Gulch	Mineral Springs	Elephant Rocks	Blanca Wetlands Expansion & Restoration	Rio Grande Natural Area	Poncha Pass/ Sage Grouse	Penitente Canyon and Elephant Rocks
√ for Yes, X for No. depending on whether site provides area for mitigation at least as large as the entire developable area of the SEZ.	Recommended mitigation sites are substantially larger than SEZs to allow for appropriate size and scope of project-level mitigation sites and actions.		This factor is one of the criteria for selecting potential mitigation sites identified in our letter. Note that since we restricted our analysis to BLM lands, we included smaller sites that were adjacent to existing protected areas or could be enlarged with the inclusion of adjacent state or private lands. We have scored this factor relative to the size of the smallest SEZ, but as written it appears that each site should be scored relative to the size of the particular SEZ it is intended to address. The matrix should be modified to clarify how the factor should be scored.										
15. Feasibility of action?	√	√	Factor not evaluated							NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	BLM has the authority to protectively manage BLM lands as a means of compensatory mitigation. The mitigation fee can be used to address administrative and management costs; the fee can also be invested in restoration projects in the mitigation sites.		This factor should be moved to the "Feasibility" section below. However, like other criteria related to feasibility, this factor applies to each of the actions taken within a site, rather than the site itself. Furthermore, the rating of this factor is largely dependent on the priorities, capacities, and institutional constraints of the implementing party, making it very difficult for outside stakeholders to assess.										
16. Links two or more protected areas?	√	√	√	√	√	X	X	X	X	√	√	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	Both mitigation sites encompass two ACECs. Important land connectivity would be established with Rio Grande Del Norte National Monument. The Rio Grande Mitigation Area (for the Antonito Southeast SEZ) would also link protective management with the San Luis Hills WSA.		The scoring system should differentiate between factors that contribute to mitigation objectives (i.e. those that compensate for adverse impacts resulting from SEZ development) and factors that provide additional conservation value to a site.										
17. Site and its proposed actions meet regional conservation/ mitigation goals and objectives?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Not Sure	Not Sure	Not Sure	Not Sure
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	Additional protections in recommended sites will meet both conservation and mitigation goals/objectives for the San Luis Valley/Taos Plateau. Increased protection of public land resources in recommended sites will provide benefits by retaining and/or improving healthy landscapes and watersheds, sustainable resource-use, and minimization of environmental harm.		This factor should be used to evaluate the potential of a site to meet mitigation objectives (i.e. those that compensate for adverse impacts resulting from SEZ development), assuming that mitigation objectives are defined. As mitigation objectives were not defined prior to asking stakeholder to identify mitigation sites, we have checked yes based on whether the site can compensate for one of the wildlife impacts assessed in our analysis.										
18. 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 18a through 18f.)	√	√	Factor not evaluated							NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
18a. Perennial, protected sources of water?	We do not have information on this at this time.	We do not have information on this at this time.								Yes	Yes		
18b. Unique species assemblages?	We do not have information on this at this time.	We do not have information on this at this time.								Yes, please refer to attachment	Yes, please refer to attachment	Yes, please refer to attachment	Yes, please refer to attachment
18c. Number of rare or at-risk species tracked by state heritage programs. (For Colorado SEZs, data from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and Natural Heritage New Mexico may be used.)	We do not have information on this at this time.	We do not have information on this at this time.								Yes, please refer to attachment	Yes, please refer to attachment	Yes, please refer to attachment	Yes, please refer to attachment
18d. Protected species and/or critical habitat?	The Rio Grande Mitigation Site includes designated critical habitat for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher												
18e. Desert washes or ephemeral drainages?	We do not have information on this at this time.	We do not have information on this at this time.								Blanca wetlands, Yes			
18f. Cultural Resources?											Rio Grande River Corridor		
18g. Other?	Citizen inventory found LWC in both the Los Mogotes East and Rio Grande Mitigation Sites.	Citizen inventory found LWC in both the Los Mogotes East and Rio Grande Mitigation Sites.								Please see attachments	Please see attachments	Please see attachments	Please see attachments

Criteria	TWS Candidate Sites		Defenders of Wildlife Candidate Sites							Ecosystem Council Candidate Sites			
	Rio Grande	Los Mogote	Twin Lakes	S. San Luis Hills	Los Mogotes	Triangle	Findlay Gulch	Mineral Springs	Elephant Rocks	Blanca Wetlands Expansion & Restoration	Rio Grande Natural Area	Poncha Pass/ Sage Grouse	Penitente Canyon and Elephant Rocks
			The scoring system should differentiate between factors that contribute to mitigation objectives (i.e., those that compensate for adverse impacts resulting from SEZ development) and factors that provide additional conservation value to a site. Our analysis identified candidate mitigation sites that compensate for adverse impacts to the resources identified in Row 16. Certainly, the presence of additional conservation values may increase the attractiveness of a particular mitigation site relative to other sites with similar mitigation values, but the site must first have established mitigation value. As described in our letter, our analysis focused primarily on identifying candidate mitigation sites on the basis of their mitigation value and we did not evaluate sites in terms of additional conservation values.										
19. Sources of data for the site.	REA data provided by Colorado BLM, San Luis Valley RMP, TWS LWC Inventory	REA data provided by Colorado BLM, San Luis Valley RMP, TWS LWC Inventory											
EFFECTIVENESS / ADDITIONALITY													
20. To what extent can the full spectrum of regional mitigation goals be met simultaneously? Use scale of 0 (low) to 5 (high).	4	4	Factor not evaluated							5	5	5	5
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).	The mitigation sites possess the full range of environmental values and resources that BLM found to warrant compensatory mitigation. This suite of resources broadly support the goals established by the SRMS. We do not have specific information regarding the potential for the mitigation sites to off-set impacts to cultural resources, Native American concerns, socioeconomic issues and environmental justice issues.		Our analysis focused on identifying candidate mitigation sites that have the potential to compensate for particular adverse impacts to wildlife resulting from development in the SEZs. We did not attempt to evaluate the extent to which the full range of mitigation objectives can be met at the site. Evaluation of this factor likely requires overlaying candidate sites proposed by multiple stakeholders and requires the identification of measurable mitigation objectives that describe the desired compensatory outcomes for the range of adverse impacts that have been identified. As a result, we did not feel that scores for this factor could be determined at this time.										
21. 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).	5	5	Factor not evaluated							5	5	5	5
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).	As supported by REA data and Citizen LWC inventories, the sites recommended for mitigation would be highly effective in achieving mitigation goals/objectives for conserving/restoring ecosystem intactness.		This factor applies to each of the actions taken within a site, although these scores could potentially be rolled up into a "site score" with additional guidance. However, the effectiveness of mitigation actions cannot be rated in the absence of specific mitigation objectives that describe the desired compensatory outcome for adverse impacts.										
22. For mitigation on BLM-administered lands, mitigation consists of actions not eligible for Bureau or other sources of funding?	√	√	Factor not evaluated							√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	Though BLM has funding for RMP revisions and amendments which could be used to support protection of the proposed mitigation sites, mitigation funds would provide a sure means of collecting the funds necessary to achieve protection of the mitigation sites and a means for investing in restoration and management of the protected mitigation sites.		This factor applies to each of the actions taken within a site, rather than the site itself. That being said, the Bureau may be better equipped to evaluate the funding mechanisms available for the proposed actions.										
FEASIBILITY													
23. What level of documentation is available to demonstrate effectiveness of mitigation action? Use scale of 1 (little to no documentation) to 5 (well-documented).	4	4	Factor not evaluated							5	5	1	5
Score 5 for documented evidence of success; Score 1 for actions with little or no prior evidence of success.	BLM has a long history of using protective management to meet goals and objectives for resources and to support multiple use and sustained yield of the varied resources and values found on public lands. This includes designations such as ACECs and establishment of protective management prescriptions through RMPs.		This factor applies to each of the actions taken within a site, rather than the site itself. While we focused our proposed actions on established interventions, additional documentation would be needed to evaluate this factor.							The feasibility for recommended sections is high.	The feasibility for recommended sections is high.	Remains unknown, until more information is gathered.	The feasibility for recommended sections is high.
24. 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).	4	4	Factor not evaluated										

Criteria	TWS Candidate Sites		Defenders of Wildlife Candidate Sites							Ecosystem Council Candidate Sites			
	Rio Grande	Los Mogote	Twin Lakes	S. San Luis Hills	Los Mogotes	Triangle	Findlay Gulch	Mineral Springs	Elephant Rocks	Blanca Wetlands Expansion & Restoration	Rio Grande Natural Area	Poncha Pass/ Sage Grouse	Penitente Canyon and Elephant Rocks
Rate the mitigation action, based on the following scale: restoration/enhancement actions (Score 5); BLM planning divisions (score 3-4); land acquisition (score 1-3); Congressional actions (score 1). 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.	BLM management decisions: the upcoming San Luis Valley RMP revision provides an existing opportunity to implement the mitigation; a stand-alone RMP amendment could also be used to implement the mitigation.	BLM management decisions: the upcoming San Luis Valley RMP revision provides an existing opportunity to implement the mitigation; a stand-alone RMP amendment could also be used to implement the mitigation.	This factor applies to the actions taken within a site, rather than the site itself. It is unclear how to derive a single score for a site for which a suite of actions has been proposed. More guidance needs to be given to the user regarding the level of specificity being requested for the identification of mitigation tools/actions at each site if this factor is to be evaluated consistently by various stakeholders.										
25. Time frame needed to establish site as mitigation location (estimated years)	Completion of SRMS	Completion of SRMS	Factor not evaluated										
Justification:	It is recommended that Mitigation Sites be established following completion of the SRMS. BLM should ensure integrity of Mitigation Sites in the interim period between completing the SRMS and when SEZ development occurs. See pp. 7-16 of the TWS comments and Attachment 4 for more details.		Since we limited our analysis to actions taken on BLM land, evaluation of this factor must be considered with respect to which actions BLM is likely to implement at the site and institutional constraints and priorities affecting implementation decisions, making it difficult for outside stakeholders to evaluate independently.										
26. Time frame for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from implementation (estimated years)	0	0	Factor not evaluated										
Justification:	Goals and objectives will be supported as soon as BLM establishes protective designations and management of mitigation sites. Investments of mitigation funds on restoration projects in the mitigation sites would take longer.		This factor applies to each of the actions taken within a site, although the scores could potentially be rolled up into a "site score" with additional guidance. However, the length of time required to achieve mitigation goals/objectives cannot be evaluated in the absence of specific mitigation objectives that describe the desired compensatory outcome(s) related to each mitigation action.										
27. Cost estimate	Variable	Variable	Factor not evaluated										
Justification:	The per-acre SRMS mitigation fee paid by developers could be used to cover BLM's administrative costs for establishing protective designations and management prescriptions, as well as for ongoing management and restoration activities in mitigation sites.		Evaluation of this factor depends on which mitigation actions are implemented at the site. However, these strategy specific rating criteria are generally used to prioritize among potential actions proposed for a site rather than the site itself. Finally, stakeholders do not necessarily have the expertise to identify the costs.										
DURABILITY													
28. How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	4	4	Factor not evaluated										
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 oversight would not be very durable (score of 1).	BLM has a variety of special designations and management actions at its disposal to establish the necessary level of durability to fulfill regional mitigation goals and objectives. BLM can add durability by creating overlapping protective designations and committing that if a mitigation site were to lose protective management, that the agency would protect another, equivalent site to maintain an equal level of mitigation. Mitigation funds would provide a durable source of funds for management.		This factor applies to actions taken at a site, rather than the site itself. Even if it applies primarily to a particular "mitigation tool," nowhere in the matrix is the user asked to identify proposed mitigation actions in terms of what administrative authority should be used to make the mitigation action durable. The BLM needs to provide the authorities available for more enduring designation and management at proposed mitigation sites before we can evaluate the durability.										
29. How durable would the mitigation be in the context of permanence of conservation and biodiversity protections? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	4	4	Factor not evaluated										
Justification:	BLM has a variety of special designations and management actions at its disposal to establish the necessary level of durability to fulfill regional mitigation goals and objectives. BLM can add durability by creating overlapping protective designations and committing that if a mitigation site were to lose protective management, that the agency would protect another, equivalent site to maintain an equal level of mitigation.		This factor cannot be evaluated by stakeholders as it requires knowledge of what administrative authorities would be used to make the sites durable.										
RISK													

Criteria	TWS Candidate Sites		Defenders of Wildlife Candidate Sites							Ecosystem Council Candidate Sites			
	Rio Grande	Los Mogote	Twin Lakes	S. San Luis Hills	Los Mogotes	Triangle	Findlay Gulch	Mineral Springs	Elephant Rocks	Blanca Wetlands Expansion & Restoration	Rio Grande Natural Area	Poncha Pass/ Sage Grouse	Penitente Canyon and Elephant Rocks
30. What are the constraints or threats to success? Include acreage of prior land use designation if they exist (e.g., corridors, mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing, OHV trails, etc.)	The overall value and quality of mitigation sites could be diminished in the interim without appropriate interim management by BLM. BLM should establish interim management to maintain the suitability of the mitigation sites, as detailed on pp. 7-16 of the TWS comments and in Attachment 4.	The overall value and quality of mitigation sites could be diminished in the interim without appropriate interim management by BLM. BLM should establish interim management to maintain the suitability of the mitigation sites, as detailed on pp. 7-16 of the TWS comments and in Attachment 4.	Constraints present at the site and in surrounding areas should be based on field evaluation. Embedded in this single criterion is an assessment of multiple factors affecting the likelihood of success. A complete evaluation of the suite of factors that would affect the outcomes of proposed actions at each mitigation site was beyond the scope of our analysis. Our analysis did, however, screen out areas that would be likely to experience future threats that may be difficult to reduce and could undermine mitigation actions taken at the site. The risk will also depend on what actions the BLM takes to limit or exclude incompatible uses.										
31. To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success? Use scale of 1 (considerable) to 5 (low).	4	4	Factor not evaluated										
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 withdrawal 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).	REA data indicates that area within and surrounding both of the proposed mitigation sites have very low and low human development intensity. Future change models indicate the proposed sites and surrounding areas may see increased development, but noticeably less use as compared to the greater San Luis Valley and Taos Plateau. Surrounding land use is not expected to significantly impact long-term success of proposed mitigation.		See above. Our analysis focused on BLM lands only and did not attempt a thorough inventory of threats on adjacent land ownerships.										
32. What is the relative probability of success? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	4	5	Factor not evaluated										
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.	The proposed mitigation sites and actions possess the full suite of environmental resources and management actions necessary to mitigate impacts from development in SEZs and to achieve SRMS goals and objectives. BLM has the authority and tools to protect the proposed mitigation sites, as well as directing mitigation fees towards restoration and management of the protected mitigation sites. We scored the Los Mogotes Mitigation Site slightly higher than the Rio Grande Mitigation Site because the table in Attachment 2 shows more improvements for mitigated resources in the Los Mogotes Mitigation Site than for the Rio Grande Mitigation Site.		Assigning subjective scores to probability of success is premature without further investigation. This is a composite factor, rating factors that we considered outside the scope of our analysis. It is unclear whether this factor would be assessed against each proposed action in the site, or the collective success of the actions assuming that they are all taken.										
33. Cumulative benefit for resources? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	5	5	Factor not evaluated										
Justification:	Given the many important resources and values found within the mitigation sites and the benefits to a multitude of resources, values and uses that protective management would provide, there will be high cumulative benefits to resources from our proposed sites and actions.		This is an important factor that should relate to the mitigation values identified on the site (i.e., benefits in terms of compensating for unavoidable impacts). For sites with high mitigation value, additional conservation benefits are determined by factors such as those evaluated in criterion 13.										
PRELIMINARY SCORING 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.	4652	4549											
			Since the score is additive and does not distinguish between factors related to mitigation value and conservation value, it would be possible for a site to receive a very high score even though it provides little mitigation benefit in terms of compensating for direct impacts from development on the SEZ(s). Therefore the score may not result in selection of the best mitigation sites that provide the greatest conservation value.										

Criteria	TNC Candidate Sites											
	De Tilla Gulch Area 1	De Tilla Gulch Area 2	De Tilla Gulch Area 3	De Tilla Gulch Area 4	De Tilla Gulch Area 5	Los Mogotes E Area 1	Los Mogotes E Area 2	Los Mogotes E Area 3	Antonito SE Area 1	Antonito SE Area 2	Antonito SE Area 3	
SITE CHARACTERISTICS												
1. Total area of site (acres)	12,802	21,020	13,557	15,854	28,317	38,711	15,552	93,074	90,867	39,532	93,912	
BLM acres	5,555	7,043	451	14,066	9,532	23,751		39,001	13,091	30,548	76,066	
private acres	6,682	13,049	12,448	1,788	12,582	12,960	15,552	47,036	73,575	6,632	4,535	
State Trust acres	565	643	523		4,297	2,000		3,391	4,201	2,352	13,213	
FWS								278				
USFS (Rio Grande Nat'l Forest)			135		1,906						98	
CDOW								3,368				
Land trust		285										
2. For ACECs, reason for designation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Justification:												
3. VRM and VRI Class												
Justification:												
4. Consistent with the Resource Management Plan?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:												
5. Same HUC 4 watershed?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Some, not all	Some, not all	
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:												
6. Current landscape condition score? (Using Landscape Assessment)	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	
7. Mitigation tool (restoration/enhancement, acquisition, banking, withdrawal, special designation, etc.)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	
Justification:	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	See TNC Attachment 4	
8. In SEZ Ecoregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:												
9. In SEZ ecological subregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:												
10. If applicable, meets priorities for ESA critical habitat?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√	X	X	
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	No critical habitat present in the SEZs or in the offset areas	Although the impact area does not contain any critical habitat, Offset Area 1 contains 3440 acres of W. yellow-billed cuckoo critical habitat.	Although the impact area does not contain any critical habitat, Offset Area 1 contains 3440 acres of W. yellow-billed cuckoo critical habitat.	Although the impact area does not contain any critical habitat, Offset Area 1 contains 3440 acres of W. yellow-billed cuckoo critical habitat.
11. Mitigates for all or most identified residual impacts that warrant regional mitigation?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.	See attachment 3 covers eco impacts, not other resources.
12. Similar landscape value, ecological functionality, biological value, species, habitat types, and/or natural features?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); depending on whether site includes resources critical to meet mitigation objectives. Justification:												
13. Dominant vegetation, condition, and acres	Salt desert scrub 3,525; desert scrub 2,956; greasewood shrubland 2,777; sand shrubland 1,354	salt desert scrub 6,120; desert scrub 4,653; greasewood shrubland 3,509; sand shrubland 2,312	Desert scrub 3,997; greasewood shrubland 3,317; sand shrubland 2,323; salt desert scrub 451	Salt desert scrub 4,840; desert scrub 2,908; sand shrubland 1,836; greasewood shrubland 596	Desert scrub 7,897; sand shrubland 4,602; salt desert scrub 3,923; greasewood shrubland 3,883	Desert scrub 16,693; salt desert scrub 5,009; greasewood shrubland 1,744; sand shrubland 187	Desert scrub 8,483; salt desert scrub 3,355; greasewood shrubland 1,085; sand shrubland 407	Desert scrub 46,159; salt desert scrub 20,230; greasewood shrubland 5,901; sand shrubland 2,791	Desert scrub 22,8990; salt desert scrub 10,718; greasewood shrubland 4,111; sand shrubland 2,763	Desert scrub 21,770; salt desert scrub 5,048; greasewood shrubland 3,830; sand shrubland 2,241	Desert scrub 26,941; salt desert scrub 32,067; greasewood shrubland 8,485; sand shrubland 676	

Criteria	TNC Candidate Sites										
	De Tilla Gulch Area 1	De Tilla Gulch Area 2	De Tilla Gulch Area 3	De Tilla Gulch Area 4	De Tilla Gulch Area 5	Los Mogotes E Area 1	Los Mogotes E Area 2	Los Mogotes E Area 3	Antonito SE Area 1	Antonito SE Area 2	Antonito SE Area 3
Justification:											
14. Provides adequate geographic extent? √ for Yes, X for No. depending on whether site provides area for mitigation at least as large as the entire developable area of the SEZ.	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
15. Feasibility of action? √ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	NEED	NEED	NEED
16. Links two or more protected areas? √ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	X	√	√	X	√	X	X	√	X	√	√
17. Site and its proposed actions meet regional conservation/mitigation goals and objectives? √ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	close to USFS	contains some land trust/ easement	adjacent to USFS	close to USFS	contains land trust/ easement	near CPW		Contains and adjacent to protected areas			
18. 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 18a through 18f.)	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
18a. Perennial, protected sources of water?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
18b. Unique species assemblages?	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3
18c. Number of rare or at-risk species tracked by state heritage programs. (For Colorado SEZs, data from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and Natural Heritage New Mexico may be used.)	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3	See attachment 3
18d. Protected species and/or critical habitat?	Gunnison sage-grouse overall range	None	None	Gunnison sage-grouse overall range, Mountain plover,	Gunnison's prairie dog - montane population	None	None	Ferruginous hawk, Gunnison sage-grouse overall range, Gunnison's prairie dog - montane population	Western yellow-billed cuckoo critical habitat, Gunnison's prairie dog - montane population, Ripley milkvetch	Gunnison's prairie dog - montane population	None
18e. Desert washes or ephemeral drainages?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				N/A	N/A	N/A
18f. Cultural Resources?											
18g. Other?											
19. Sources of data for the site.	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve	LANDFIRE, CNHP, CPW, Nature Serve
EFFECTIVENESS / ADDITIONALITY											
20. To what extent can the full spectrum of regional mitigation goals 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).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
21. 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).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
22. For mitigation on BLM-administered lands, mitigation consists of actions not eligible for Bureau or other sources of funding? √ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Criteria	TNC Candidate Sites										
	De Tilla Gulch Area 1	De Tilla Gulch Area 2	De Tilla Gulch Area 3	De Tilla Gulch Area 4	De Tilla Gulch Area 5	Los Mogotes E Area 1	Los Mogotes E Area 2	Los Mogotes E Area 3	Antonito SE Area 1	Antonito SE Area 2	Antonito SE Area 3
FEASIBILITY											
23. What level of documentation is available to demonstrate effectiveness of mitigation action? Use scale of 1 (little to no documentation) to 5 (well-documented).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Score 5 for documented evidence of success; Score 1 for actions with little or no prior evidence of success.											
24. 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).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Rate the mitigation action, based on the following scale: restoration/enhancement actions (Score 5); BLM planning divisions (score 3-4); land acquisition (score 1-3); Congressional actions (score 1). 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.											
25. Time frame needed to establish site as mitigation location (estimated years)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Justification:											
26. Time frame for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from implementation (estimated years)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Justification:											
27. Cost estimate	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Justification:											
DURABILITY											
28. How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
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 oversight would not be very durable (score of 1).											
29. How durable would the mitigation be in the context of permanence of conservation and biodiversity protections? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Justification:											
RISK											
30. What are the constraints or threats to success? Include acreage of prior land use designation if they exist (e.g., corridors, mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing, OHV trails, etc.)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
31. To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success? Use scale of 1 (considerable) to 5 (low).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
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 withdrawal 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).											

Criteria	TNC Candidate Sites										
	De Tilla Gulch Area 1	De Tilla Gulch Area 2	De Tilla Gulch Area 3	De Tilla Gulch Area 4	De Tilla Gulch Area 5	Los Mogotes E Area 1	Los Mogotes E Area 2	Los Mogotes E Area 3	Antonito SE Area 1	Antonito SE Area 2	Antonito SE Area 3
32. What is the relative probability of success? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
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.											
33. Cumulative benefit for resources? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).						TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Justification:											
PRELIMINARY SCORING 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.											

Criteria	CPW Candidate Sites						CCCW Candidate Sites		
	Trickle Mtn Saguache Creek	Tracy Biedell	Poncha Pass	Mogotes Conejos	Rio Grande Corridor	Cumbres Toltec	Capulin	Old Capulin Dump	37.26645 - 106.112232
SITE CHARACTERISTICS									
1. Total area of site (acres)									
BLM acres									
private acres									
State Trust acres									
FWS									
USFS (Rio Grande Nat'l Forest)									
CDO									
Land trust									
2. For ACECs, reason for designation							N/A	N/A	N/A
Justification:									
3. VRM and VRI Class									
Justification:									
4. Consistent with the Resource Management Plan?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	X	X	X
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
5. Same HUC 4 watershed?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
6. Current landscape condition score? (Using Landscape Assessment)									
7. Mitigation tool (restoration/enhancement, acquisition, banking, withdrawal, special designation, etc.)	Acquisition, habitat enhancement,								
Justification:									
8. In SEZ Ecoregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
9. In SEZ ecological subregion?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
10. If applicable, meets priorities for ESA critical habitat?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	X	X	X
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
11. Mitigates for all or most identified residual impacts that warrant regional mitigation?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
12. Similar landscape value, ecological functionality, biological value, species, habitat types, and/or natural features?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	√	√	√
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); depending on whether site includes resources critical to meet mitigation objectives. Justification:									
13. Dominant vegetation, condition, and acres									
Justification:									
14. Provides adequate geographic extent?	√	√	√	√	√	√	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes, X for No. depending on whether site provides area for mitigation at least as large as the entire developable area of the SEZ.									
15. Feasibility of action?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
16. Links two or more protected areas?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									

Criteria	CPW Candidate Sites						CCCW Candidate Sites		
	Trickle Mtn Saguache Creek	Tracy Biedell	Poncha Pass	Mogotes Conejos	Rio Grande Corridor	Cumbres Toltec	Capulin	Old Capulin Dump	37.26645 - 106.112232
17. Site and its proposed actions meet regional conservation/ mitigation goals and objectives?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
18. 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 18a through 18f.)	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
18a. Perennial, protected sources of water?									
18b. Unique species assemblages?									
18c. Number of rare or at-risk species tracked by state heritage programs. (For Colorado SEZs, data from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and Natural Heritage New Mexico may be used.)									
18d. Protected species and/or critical habitat?									
18e. Desert washes or ephemeral drainages?									
18f. Cultural Resources?									
18g. Other?									
19. Sources of data for the site.									
EFFECTIVENESS / ADDITIONALITY									
20. To what extent can the full spectrum of regional mitigation goals be met simultaneously? Use scale of 0 (low) to 5 (high).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
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).									
21. 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).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
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).									
22. For mitigation on BLM-administered lands, mitigation consists of actions not eligible for Bureau or other sources of funding?	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
√ for Yes (1 point), X for No (-2); Justification:									
FEASIBILITY									
23. What level of documentation is available to demonstrate effectiveness of mitigation action? Use scale of 1 (little to no documentation) to 5 (well-documented).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
Score 5 for documented evidence of success; Score 1 for actions with little or no prior evidence of success.									
24. 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).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
Rate the mitigation action, based on the following scale: restoration/enhancement actions (Score 5); BLM planning divisions (score 3-4); land acquisition (score 1-3); Congressional actions (score 1). 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.									
25. Time frame needed to establish site as mitigation location (estimated years)									
Justification:									
26. Time frame for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from implementation (estimated years)									
Justification:									
27. Cost estimate									
Justification:									

Criteria	CPW Candidate Sites						CCCW Candidate Sites		
	Trickle Mtn Saguache Creek	Tracy Biedell	Poncha Pass	Mogotes Conejos	Rio Grande Corridor	Cumbres Toltec	Capulin	Old Capulin Dump	37.26645 - 106.112232
DURABILITY									
28. How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
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 oversight would not be very durable (score of 1).									
29. How durable would the mitigation be in the context of permanence of conservation and biodiversity protections? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
Justification:									
RISK									
30. What are the constraints or threats to success? Include acreage of prior land use designation if they exist (e.g., corridors, mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing, OHV trails, etc.)									
31. To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success? Use scale of 1 (considerable) to 5 (low).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
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 withdrawal 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).									
32. What is the relative probability of success? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED	NEED
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.									
33. Cumulative benefit for resources? Use scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).									
Justification:									
PRELIMINARY SCORING 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.									