



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



Applicant City of White Salmon	Project Name Buck Creek to Grand Ronde Aquifer ASR Project	Category S
WRIA 29	County Klickitat, Skamania	

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	2	-	2	2	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	2
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	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	0
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	-	1	1	-	-	1	0	-	-	-	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 100 to 1000 AF > 1000 AF	0 1 2	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1
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	-	2	-	-	3	0	-	-	-	2
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	-	4	-	4	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	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	-	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
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																0

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	-	-	-	-	-	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	-	-	-	-	-	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	1.6
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	-	-	-	-	-	.8	-	-	-	-	-	.8
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	-	-	-	-	-	.8	-	-	-	-	-	.8
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	-	-	-	-	-	.2	-	-	-	-	-	.2
* 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.																4
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																4

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	4	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	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	4	6	6	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE																10
TOTAL UNWEIGHTED SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES																24

FINAL APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Buck Creek to Grand Ronde Aquifer ASR 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	7	3.3	33	23.1
3. Project Support	10	0	1.5	15	0
4. Fish/Water Quality Benefits	10	4	2.2	22	8.8
5. Long Term Resources	10	10	1	10	10
TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES	50	24	10	100	47.9

CR-TAG Comments / Annotations:

Jon Culp: Section 3 should score a 0 as there is no project support listed in the application. So, unless I missed something on the sight visit. . . Unfortunately, this section doesn't allow for a zero score. Was this done intentionally?

Dan Haller: What water right will be used? The 3/4ths they are paying for can come out of their water right. The 1/4th we're paying for is tough. Can't priority process whole thing under Hillis cause 2/4 of that will be used for new consumptive permits. Could assign 2/3 benefit through secondary use permit, priority process fish only water?

Peggy Miller: Fish and Water Quality Benefits for The Buck Creek ASR feasibility project depend on the implementation of other potential projects. Without the implementation of fish ladders and the removal of Condit Dam this project has very little fish and wildlife benefits. Even though 1/3 of the CRBWMP supported water will return to the ocean, this project is low in the system and flows will only benefit a small portion of the Columbia River.

- Removal of Condit Dam is years away and it is uncertain if a fish ladder will be built for fish passage into the upper basin.
- POD dam currently stops bedload recruitment. Implementation of an action to prevent or supplement bedload recruitment will improve spawning habitat.
- Ensuring fish passage at the Huseman POD will improve stream habitat conditions and merit a higher instream habitat score.

Onni Perala: I agree they have a problem but I think it is better solved through other sources like health, public systems assistance, disaster relief. It's not fishery resources management issue.