



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



|  |   |                       |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| <b>Applicant</b><br>Palouse-Rock Lake CD | <b>Project Name</b><br>Rock Lake Water Supply and Habitat Enhancement Study | <b>Category</b><br>FS |
| <b>WRIA</b><br>34                        | <b>County</b><br>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%<br>25 to 50%<br>> 50%  | 0<br>1<br>2           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | -        | 0 |
| Total Cost Per Acre Foot [§3a & §3c]   | Water procured at a lower cost should score higher.  | Funding provided<br>\$0 to 100<br>\$101-1000<br>\$1001-3000<br>> \$3000 per acre foot | 3<br>2<br>1<br>0      | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | -        | 3 |
| Total Cost Per Acre Foot of Consumptive Water [§3a & §3c]  | Water procured at a lower cost should score higher.  | \$0 to 100<br>\$101-500<br>\$501-1000<br>\$1001-3000<br>> \$3000 per acre foot        | 5<br>4<br>3<br>2<br>1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | - | - | 1 | 0 | - | - | - | -        | 5 |
| <b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>   |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | <b>8</b> |   |

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

| 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 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | -        | 0 |
| 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 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | -        | 0 |
| <b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>   |   |  |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | <b>0</b> |   |

| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | 1.17 | - | - | - | - | 1.17     | - |
| 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   | - | - | - | - | - | 1.4  | - | - | - | - | 1.4      | - |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | 0    | - | - | - | - | 0        | - |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | .4   | - | - | - | - | .4       | - |
| 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   | - | - | - | - | - | 0    | - | - | - | - | 0        | - |
| 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  | - | - | - | - | .23      | - |
| <b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>                                     |   |                                 |       |     |   |   |   |   |   |      |   |   |   |   | <b>4</b> |   |

\* 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<br>No   | 4<br>0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | -         | 0 |
| <b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>   |  |   |        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | <b>0</b>  |   |
| <b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES</b>   |  |   |        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | <b>22</b> |   |

# FINAL APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Rock Lake Water Supply and Habitat Enhancement Study

| Weighting Table                       |                                   |                        |                  |                                 |                |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Categories                            | Maximum Possible Unweighted Score | Total Unweighted Score | Weighting Factor | Maximum Possible Weighted Score | Weighted Score |
| 1. Project Costs                      | 10                                | 8                      | 2                | 20                              | <b>16</b>      |
| 2. Net Water Savings                  | 10                                | 10                     | 3.3              | 33                              | <b>33</b>      |
| 3. Project Support                    | 10                                | 0                      | 1.5              | 15                              | <b>0</b>       |
| 4. Fish/Water Quality Benefits        | 10                                | 4                      | 2.2              | 22                              | <b>8.8</b>     |
| 5. Long Term Resources                | 10                                | 0                      | 1                | 10                              | <b>0</b>       |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES</b> | 50                                | 22                     | 10               | 100                             | <b>57.8</b>    |

CR-TAG Comments / Annotations:

*Jon Culp:* Section 3 and 5 read a 0 for totals for these sections.

*Dave Cummings:* Rock Lake Water Supply and Habitat Enhancement Study - Best potential storage project, as measured by likely cost and impacts. If the water is available, I would urge my fellow TAG members to support this project.

*Dan Haller:* The project scored high on Section 1 due to the low cost per ac-ft, where the cost is based solely on feasibility and not construction. Scores would be lower if construction costs were included.

*Peggy Miller:* A feasibility study is proposed increase storage within Rock Lake. 1/3 of the water supported by CRBWMP funds would be dedicated to instream flows to the ocean. The fisheries co-managers will provide guidance for the management of the instream portion of the water to provide the most fish benefits possible. There are no ESA stocks or anadromous fisheries above Palouse Falls and the outlet from the existing lake is over 60 miles upstream from the Snake River. ESA listed salmonids are found in the snake River and lower Columbia River. It would be difficult to discern temperature influence during a critical period (summer). Rock Creek could possibly benefit from flow supplementation and water quality improvements. There is concern for the loss of riparian habitat and functions along the existing lake shoreline if the lake is raised to supply 120,000 more acre-feet of storage. Potential effects on wildlife and habitat from higher lake elevations and fluctuating water levels include:

- loss of usable edge habitat
- loss of native vegetation that increasingly is taken over by exotic species and noxious weeds
- loss of actual terrestrial habitat available, especially cliff, caves, etc.
- increased human use combined with the limiting of available habitat, negatively impacts species behavior
- release of warm water in the summer. The southern end of Rock Lake is where the highest summer temperatures were recorded at nearly 22 degrees C and extremely turbid. The lake is highly stratified and remains so from June- September.

*Onni Perala:* Nothing to rate; hurriedly gathered-no scope, no proposal, can't see a report out of this that would propose anything substantive.