



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



Applicant The Lands Council	Project Name Beaver Population Enhancement and Water Storage	Category FS
WRIA 54, 55, 57	County Spokane, Stevens, Grant, Okanogan, Ferry, Pend Oreille, Douglas, Whitman	

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% 25 to 50% > 50%	0 1 2	2	0	-	1	1	-	-	0	2	-	-	-	1
Total Cost Per Acre Foot [§3a & §3c]	Water procured at a lower cost should score higher.	\$0 to 100 \$101-1000 \$1001-3000 > \$3000 per acre foot	3 2 1 0	3	0	-	0	3	-	-	0	2	-	-	-	3
Total Cost Per Acre Foot of Consumptive Water [§3a & §3c]	Water procured at a lower cost should score higher.	\$0 to 100 \$101-500 \$501-1000 \$1001-3000 > \$3000 per acre foot	5 4 3 2 1	5	-	-	1	5	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	5
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																9

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 100 to 1000 AF > 1000 AF	0 1 2	2	-	0	-	2	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	2
Estimate Total Water Added to a Tributary reach as a Percent of Low Flow [§3c]		< 5% 5 to 10% 10 to 25% 25 to 50% > 50%	0 1 2 3 4	4	-	0	-	1	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	1
Water can be Protected to the Columbia or Snake	Review of the water rights priority confirms either a yes or no here.	Yes No	4 0	4	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	4
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																7

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	-	5	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	5
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	-	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																6

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	-	-	-	-	-	1.33	-	-	-	-	1.33	-
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	-	-	-	-	1	-
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	-	-	-	-	-	.9	-	-	-	-	.9	-
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	-	-	-	-	-	.6	-	-	-	-	.6	-
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	-	-	-	-	-	.47	-	-	-	-	.47	-
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	-	-	-	-	-	.27	-	-	-	-	.27	-
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																5

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	0	4	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
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	0	6	6	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																0
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES																27

FINAL APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Beaver Population Enhancement and Water Storage

Weighting Table					
Categories	Maximum Possible Unweighted Score	Total Unweighted Score	Weighting Factor	Maximum Possible Weighted Score	Weighted Score
1. Project Costs	10	9	2	20	18
2. Net Water Savings	10	7	3.3	33	23.1
3. Project Support	10	6	1.5	15	9
4. Fish/Water Quality Benefits	10	5	2.2	22	11
5. Long Term Resources	10	0	1	10	0
TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES	50	27	10	100	52.1

CR-TAG Comments / Annotations:

Jon Culp: Interesting idea. I am a little unsure of the 25 af / beaver assumption. I suppose this number would firm up under a funded feasibility study. Also, my feeling is that beavers, being quite adaptable and mobile, are mostly in places where they are presently sustainable and am unsure that there are many more places where introduced beavers w/o a lot of habitat work would not stay put. Scored 0 on net water savings because of its feasibility phase.

David Cummings: Storage permanence is unsupportable given current understanding of quality of beaver construction methods.

Dan Haller: Section 1 score is higher because cost is based only on feasibility, not implementation. Unsure whether water could be trusted or stored water quantified. Retiming uncertain. Environmental review needed. **This is re-timed water.**

Peggy Miller: This proposal is difficult to score. Specific sites would allow for increase evaluation of stream priorities. On the other hand this project scored high for terrestrial species and specific sites would reduce the size of the potential species list. Translocation of beavers would allow for the occurrence of natural processes. The long-term potential value is significant for ecosystem education, water savings, floodplain management, natural hydrogeology within the floodplains, fish life benefits, and instream flow restoration opportunities. One significant hurdle of translocations will be combating the public's perception that beavers flood residences and must be removed.

Onni Perala: Sounds good-what does it impact- I guess that's why the study...I guess it's something to try.