



Columbia River Basin Water Management Program Technical Advisory Group FINAL APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET



Applicant Raymond Lam/Boise White Paper LLC	Project Name Boise White Paper, LLC, Wallula Aquifer Storage Project	Category S
WRIA 32	County Walla Walla	

Subcategory	Description	Scoring Levels	Points per Level	Maximum Possible Score	Bruce Beauchene	Jon Culp	Dave Cummings	Dan Haller	Steve Martin	Peggy Miller	Mark Nielson	Onni Perala	Tom Ring	Steve Hays	Paul LaRiviere	Final Score
-------------	-------------	----------------	------------------	------------------------	-----------------	----------	---------------	------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	----------	------------	----------------	-------------

1. PROJECT COSTS																
Percentage (of the Entire Project) of Matching Funds or In-Kind Match Available to Proponent [§3b]	Projects that can secure funding from local or "other" sources should be more attractive to Ecology.	0 to 25%	0	2	0	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	0
		25 to 50%	1													
		> 50%	2													
		Funding provided														
Total Cost Per Acre Foot [§3a & §3c]	Water procured at a lower cost should score higher.	\$0 to 100	3													
		\$101-1000	2	3	1	-	2	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1
		\$1001-3000	1													
		> \$3000 per acre foot	0													
Total Cost Per Acre Foot of Consumptive Water [§3a & §3c]	Water procured at a lower cost should score higher.	\$0 to 100	5													
		\$101-500	4	5	2	-	1	2	-	-	2	4	-	-	-	2
		\$501-1000	3													
		\$1001-3000	2													
		> \$3000 per acre foot	1													
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																3

2. NET WATER SAVINGS																
Estimate Total Water Placed in Storage for State Use or in Trust Through This Project [§3c]	Projects that put larger amounts of water in terms of acre feet should be scored at a higher level.	<100 AF	0	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2
		100 to 1000 AF	1													
		> 1000 AF	2													
Estimate Total Water Added to a Tributary reach as a Percent of Low Flow [§3c]		< 5%	0	4	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	0
		5 to 10%	1													
		10 to 25%	2													
		25 to 50%	3													
		> 50%	4													
Water can be Protected to the Columbia or Snake	Review of the water rights priority confirms either a yes or no here.	Yes	4	4	-	4	-	4	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	4
		No	0													
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																6

3. PROJECT SUPPORT																
Consistency with Other Local Plans [§3d]	Projects that are consistent with, or called for in, local planning documents receive a higher score.	1 point for each planning document up to 6 points	1-6	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	6
Local Support [§3e]	Projects accompanied by many letters of support score higher.	1 point for each letter of support up to 4 letters	1-4	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	4
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																10

4. FISH AND WATER QUALITY BENEFITS																
Current Instream Species and Status [§2]	Consideration of presence and status of salmonids, amphibians, and other aquatic species, and prioritization of this stream reach for instream flow restoration.	See Fish & Water Quality matrix	0-2.5	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	.83	-	-	2	-	1
Current Instream Habitat Conditions [§2]	Analysis of need for project in relation to reach length, need for barrier removal, riffle depth, distance to holding cover and off-channel habitat access.	See Fish & Water Quality matrix	0-3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	-	0	-	.5
Terrestrial Species, Habitat Conditions and Potential for Improvement [§2]	Consideration of local species and status, species richness, the terrestrial migration corridor, & anticipated improvement to overall terrestrial habitat values.	See Fish & Water Quality matrix	0-1.5	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	.7	-	-	0	-	.55
Potential Future Water Quantity or Quality Conditions [§2]	Consideration of the project's effect on flow quantity and flow timing, as well as degree of flow and water quality improvement that is anticipated as a result of the project.	See Fish & Water Quality matrix	0-1.5	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	.9	-	-	.5	-	.45
Ecological Considerations * [§2]	Consideration of expected project effectiveness in relation to ecological connectivity, potential effects of climate change, improvement in riparian condition and function, whether current or future exempt wells affect project effectiveness, & potential effect of the planned construction.	See Fish & Water Quality matrix	0-1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	.6	-	-	.25	-	.45
Social and Human Aspects [§2]	Potential effects of future development and land use conversions on project values to fish/wildlife; effects on supplementation efforts and fish and wildlife recreation and potential to contribute to local goodwill.	See Fish & Water Quality matrix	0-0.5	.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	.23	-	-	.1	-	.13
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																4.5

* If the project is anticipated to impose more than short-term negative construction effects on fish/wildlife (i.e. is likely to cause harm), the total fish and wildlife score will be zero.

5. CURRENT AND LONG TERM RESOURCES																
Adequate Resources Currently Committed to Ensure Long-Term Performance of the Proposed Project [§3f]	This category can be scored with a positive number if there are resources listed to support operations and maintenance and a zero if not	Yes No	4 0	4	4	4	0	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	4
Proponent's Readiness to Proceed [§3g]	This category is based on the applicant's progress in designing and permitting the project prior to filing an application.	Range between No Progress and Approved Construction Documents	0-6	6	1	1	0	-	-	-	-	1	6	-	-	1
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																5

TOTAL UNWEIGHTED SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES **28.5**

FINAL APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Boise White Paper, LLC, Wallula Aquifer Storage Project

Weighting Table					
Categories	Maximum Possible Unweighted Score	Total Unweighted Score	Weighting Factor	Maximum Possible Weighted Score	Weighted Score
1. Project Costs	10	3	2	20	6
2. Net Water Savings	10	6	3.3	33	19.8
3. Project Support	10	10	1.5	15	15
4. Fish/Water Quality Benefits	10	4.5	2.2	22	9.9
5. Long Term Resources	10	5	1	10	5
TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES	50	28	10	100	55.7

CR-TAG Comments / Annotations:

Jon Culp: Seems like a good project, if the retiming is right. Seems awful close to the river and quite sandy soil to affect much hold.

Dan Haller: There is a math error in the application. Cost per ac-ft should be \$2,750/ac-ft, not \$272/ac-ft.

Peggy Miller: Even though ESA salmonids are found in the secondary reach below Boise White Paper to the ocean, the Boise White Paper ARS has very little fish and wildlife benefits. The cold water resulting from the project would result in little change to the Columbia River - the percent gain of water quality and quantity benefits is very small and not measurable. Potential benefits include:

- Retiming of water such that pumping from the Columbia River is reduced during July-Sept; and
- The potential to influence shoreline habitat utilized by the non-ESA fall Chinook juveniles.

Onni Perala: Looks OK, but again I question what the commitment is to operate and maintain the result. I don't see where their interest and loyalty is when money gets tight. Will the project carry on or be a cost cutting measure?

Tom Ring: Consumptive use change not clear from app. Dueling consultants on feasibility? Compatible with all known plans, but not letters of support.