



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



<b>Applicant</b> Stevens Public Utility District	<b>Project Name</b> Mill Creek Water Storage Project	<b>Category</b> FS
<b>WRIA</b> 59	<b>County</b> Stevens	

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													
		\$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													
		\$501-1000	3													
		\$1001-3000	2													
		> \$3000 per acre foot	1													
<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	0	2	-	0	-	2	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	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													
		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													
		No	0													
<b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>																<b>7</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	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	4
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	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3
<b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>																<b>7</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	-	-	-	-	-	.7	-	-	-	-	.7	-
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	-	-	-	-	-	.2	-	-	-	-	.2	-
<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.</b>																<b>4</b>
<b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>																<b>4</b>

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	0	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	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	6	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
<b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED CATEGORY SCORE</b>																<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL UNWEIGHTED SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES</b>																<b>24</b>

# FINAL APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

## Mill Creek Water Storage Project

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	7	3.3	33	<b>23.1</b>
3. Project Support	10	7	1.5	15	<b>10.5</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	24	10	100	<b>58.4</b>

CR-TAG Comments / Annotations:

*Jon Culp:* Section 5 scored a 1 under readiness to proceed, but drop down wasn't available, so total is 1

*Dan Haller:* Section 1 score is higher because cost is based only on feasibility, not implementation.

*Peggy Miller:* This project is scored with the information available. The information necessary to realize the potential fish and wildlife value of this project will available in the feasibility study.

The Mill Creek feasibility study proposes a surface storage reservoir. 1/3 of the water supported by CRBWMP funds would be dedicated to instreams 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. This water will have benefits in Colville Creek as well as the Columbia River.

As described, this project may inundate functioning stream and riparian habitat and inundation of this functioning habitat may require mitigation to offset the lost of function and values.

*Onni Perala:* Don't tell us why we should study this for feasibility. Where is the need? Convince us of a need for this over the status quo.