**BLM Afton SEZ - Evaluation Criteria for Candidate Mitigation Sites and Actions to Address Impacts to Special Designations.**

Afton SEZ General Characteristics and Information (for comparison with mitigation sites) - Contiguous area: 30,668 acres (all BLM-administered land); 29,964 acres identified as developable in Solar PEIS; through this Solar Regional Mitigation Strategy (SRMS) recommend revision to 22,600 acres developable. Sources of data are the Solar PEIS, draft Tricounty Resource Management Plan (RMP), and Mimbres RMP.

Special Designations Possibly Impacted: Butterfield Trail, El Camino Real NHT, West Potrillo Mtns/Mt. Riley WSA, Organ Mtns-Desert Peaks NM

Afton SRMS Mitigation Desired Outcome for Special Designations: No net loss of scenic experience (day and night), as seen from visually-sensitive Special Designations. No net loss of feelings of naturalness and solitude, as seen from Wilderness Areas (WAs) and Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs). Restoration of naturalness.

|  | **Stakeholder Candidate Mitigation Site/Action #1** | **Stakeholder Candidate Mitigation Site/Action #2** | **Stakeholder Candidate Mitigation Site/Action #3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL RESOURCE INFORMATION** | | | |
| **Contiguous area of candidate mitigation site (acres, also include township range and section if available); please provide GIS files if possible** |  |  |  |
| **Acres on BLM-administered land** |  |  |  |
| **Private acres** |  |  |  |
| **Other Public Management (State, County, Tribal, other federal)** |  |  |  |
| **Does the area currently have a special designation? If so, please provide the name of the designation (i.e., ACEC, WSA, etc.), and what the protection is for (e.g., cultural, biological, scenic resources). If WSA, briefly describe the wilderness characteristics.** |  |  |  |
| **Sources of data for the candidate mitigation site/action(s)** |  |  |  |
| **Description of Mitigation Site/Action** |  |  |  |
| **What are the proposed component activities associated with this mitigation site/action? (e.g., restoration/ enhancement, acquisition, preservation, etc.)** |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **For Mitigation Criteria Areas 1 through 8 below, the BLM will use information provided by stakeholders as well as BLM resource specialist knowledge of the mitigation sites and/or actions to provide subtotal and overall scores.** | | | |
| **1. IMPORTANCE:** | | | |
| **1a. Degree of support from tribal governments, other tribal entities, local communities, federal, state, and local governments, subject matter experts, and the public at large.**  *Rate as high, moderate, or low and provide supporting information if possible.* |  |  |  |
| **1b. If site is located on BLM-administered land, is proposed mitigation consistent with the Resource Management Plan? Please explain.**  *Yes if one or more Plan goals are addressed; maybe if no Plan goals are addressed; No if use is inconsistent with Plan goals. Enter N/A if not applicable (i.e., not on BLM land).* |  |  |  |
| **1c. Site and its proposed actions meet local, State, and/or other Federal regional conservation planning goals and objectives?** *Yes if 1 or more Plans goal are addressed; maybe if no Plan goals are addressed; No if use is inconsistent with Plan goals. Enter N/A if not applicable (i.e., not on BLM land).* |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Importance Score (range 0 to 5):**  *Based on input to criteria 1a. to 1c., score of 0 to 5 will be assigned, where 5 indicates that the nominated site/action is highly important and 0 indicates very low importance based on the degree of support from tribal governments; other tribal entities; local communities; Federal, State, and local governments; subject matter experts; and the public at large.* |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **2. FEASIBILITY** | | | |
| **2a. What level of documentation is available to demonstrate feasibility of mitigation action? (i.e., Is there documentation to show that this type of action has been used previously?)**  *Rate as little to no documentation, some documentation, or well-documented - list documents and provide with submission if possible.* |  |  |  |
| **2b. Based on action required (e.g., restoration, BLM land management action, land acquisition, Congressional action), how difficult will implementation be?**  *Rate as highly difficult, moderately difficult, or relatively easy, and provide rationale.* |  |  |  |
| **2c. Cost estimate. (2017 $)** |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Feasibility Score (range 0 to 5):**  *Based on input to criteria 2a. to 2c. assessing technical, administrative, and political feasibility, score of 0 to 5 will be assigned, where 5 indicates that the nominated site/action is highly feasible technically, administratively, and politically. 2-4 points for moderate technical, administrative, and/or political feasibility. 0-1 indicates very low feasibility.* |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **3. EFFECTIVENESS** | | | |
| **3a. How effective will the mitigation be in the context of achieving regional compensatory mitigation goals/objectives for conserving/restoring resource impacts?**  *Rate as high, moderate, or low effectiveness, and provide rationale.* |  |  |  |
| **3b. To what degree does this action mitigate for all or most identified residual impacts to special designations that warrant compensatory mitigation?** |  |  |  |
| **3c. Is the candidate site in the same geographic region as the SEZ?**  *Yes or No. Also, what is the approximate distance from the SEZ?* |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Effectiveness Score (range 0 to 5):**  *Based on input to criteria 3a. to 3c., score of 0 to 5 will be assigned, 5 points for actions/locations that fully mitigate all of those unavoidable impacts that warrant mitigation; 2-4 points for actions/locations that fully or partially mitigate some of the unavoidable impacts that warrant mitigation; and 0-1 point for partially mitigating one of the unavoidable impacts that warrants mitigation.* |  |  |  |
| **4. TIMELINESS** | | | |
| **4a. Timeframe needed to establish site as mitigation location. (estimated years)** |  |  |  |
| **4b. Timeframe for achieving mitigation goals and objectives from start of mitigation implementation. (estimated years)** |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Timeliness Score (range 0 to 3):**  *Based on input to criteria 4a. and 4b., score of 0 to 3 will be assigned, 3 points for projects that are expected to deliver full benefits immediately; 2 points for projects that are expected to deliver benefits that are not immediate but within a reasonable amount of time after implementation; and 0-1 point for projects that will deliver benefits with a significant delay after implementation.* |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **5. RISK** | | | |
| **5a. List the constraints or threats present at the site or in surrounding areas that could jeopardize long-term success of the mitigation action(s) (e.g., presence of prior land use designations such as corridors, mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing, OHV trails, etc.)** |  |  |  |
| **5b. To what extent will surrounding land uses impact mitigation success (e.g., proximity to expanding urban areas, pressures on region for recreational land use, excessive groundwater withdrawal and drawdown intactness that could affect resources on the mitigation site)?** *Note if surrounding land uses are similar to or compatible with mitigation actions, surrounding land uses are incompatible with mitigation actions or present significant pressure for use of the site for incompatible uses, or if surrounding land uses effects on mitigation actions are unknown.* |  |  |  |
| **5c. Are there documented results of similar mitigation actions that have been successful?** *List documents and provide with submission if possible.* |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Risk Score (range 0 to 5):**  *Based on input to criteria 5a. to 5c., score of 0 to 5 will be assigned. 5 points for a high degree of certainty based on documented results of success in similar situations. 3-4 points for moderate degree of certainty based on documented results of success in similar situation. 1-2 point for moderate degree of certainty based on expert opinion. 0 points for high risk proposal.* |  |  |  |
| **6. DURABILITY** | | | |
| **6a. How durable would the mitigation be from a timeframe and management perspective?** *Rate as high, moderate, or low durability and provide rationale.*  *Durability considerations include time (mitigation should be effective throughout the duration of project impacts), administration (restricting incompatible uses), and financial (funds available to maintain, monitor, and adaptively manage the mitigation measures).* |  |  |  |
| **6b. Would the mitigation require maintenance to remain effective?**  *(e.g., would color treating need retreatment in 10-20 years?)* |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Durability Score (range 0 to 5):**  *Based on input to criteria 6a. and 6b., score of 0 to 5 will be assigned. 5 points for actions/locations that are a one-time investment and have a high level of certainty that they will last longer than the impacts. 2-4 points for action/locations that have moderate level of certainty that they will last longer than the impacts and/or require additional funding. 0-1 points for actions/locations that are at risk of failing to last longer than the impacts.* |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **7. ADDITIONALITY** | | | |
| **7a. For mitigation on BLM-administered lands, does mitigation consist of actions not eligible for Bureau or other sources of funding?**  *Yes or no. Please explain.* |  |  |  |
| **7b. Have previous mitigation/restoration actions been taken to mitigate impacts in this area?**  *Yes or no. Please explain.* |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Additionality Score (range 0 to 3):**  *Based on input to criteria 7a. and 7b., score of 0 to 3 will be assigned, where 5 indicates that 100% of the nominated site/action is in addition to currently funded BLM or other activities and 0 indicates that 100% of the nominated site/action is not additional.* |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **8. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS** | | | |
| **8a. Indirect benefits to other resources identified to warrant compensatory mitigation (Vegetation).** |  |  |  |
| **8b. Indirect benefits to other resources identified to warrant compensatory mitigation (*Visual Resources*).** |  |  |  |
| **8c. Degree of benefit to other resources not identified to warrant compensatory mitigation.** |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal Additional Considerations Score**  **(range 0 to 3):**  *Based on input to criteria 8a. to 8c., score of 0 to 3 will be assigned, where 3 indicates that the nominated site/action addresses several additional considerations and 0 indicates no additional considerations.* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total Site/Action Score (range 0 to 34):**  *Subtotal scores will be added to get total score for each mitigation site/action, as a basis for comparison* |  |  |  |