



Flow Achievement and Watershed Plan Implementation Grant Program

STORAGE STUDY APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

| | |
|---|---|
| Applicant Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council | Project Name Aquifer Replenishment Program – Phase 3 |
| WRIA 32 – Walla Walla | County Walla Walla |
| Application Number E – S035 | Evaluator Tom Culhane, Dave Nazy, Bob Barwin, Al Josephy, Dave Burdick, Jonathan Kohr, Paul Lariviere |

Evaluation Criteria

| Sub-Category | Description | Scoring Levels | Points Per Level | Max Possible Score | Score |
|--|--|--|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Project Costs | | | | | Potential Score: 40 |
| Percentage (of the Entire Project) of Matching Funds or In-Kind Match Available to Proponent | Projects that can secure funding from local or "other" sources should be more attractive to Ecology. | 0 to 25% 25 to 50% > 50% Funding provided | 0-3 4-6 7-10 | 10 | 0 |
| Site Suitability for a Storage Study | Is the study site in an area with present or projected groundwater shortages? | Degree of shortage | 0-5 | 30 | 4 |
| | Is there enough water for a storage project? | Water availability | 0-10 | | 1 |
| | Can water rights be obtained? | Certainty of water rights | 0-5 | | 4 |
| | Would stored water be protected from withdrawal or have impact on existing wells? | Impact on other wells | 0-5 | | 5 |
| | Does the Aquifer have sufficient storage? | Storage capability | 0-5 | | 3 |
| Total Unweighted Category #1 Score | | | | | 17 |

| 2. Flow and Habitat Benefits | | | Potential Score: 40 | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----|----------|
| Current Instream Species, Status, and Reach Priority | Consideration of presence and status of salmonids, amphibians, and other aquatic species, and prioritization of this stream reach for instream flow restoration. | Low function and values | 0-3 | 10 | 5 |
| | | Medium function and value | 4-7 | | |
| | | High function and value | 8-10 | | |
| Potential Future Water Timing and/or Quality Conditions | Consideration of the project's effect on flow timing, as well as degree of water quality improvement that is anticipated as a result of the project. | Flow timing benefits | 0-5 | 10 | 8 |
| | | Water quality improvements | 0-5 | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|----|----------|
| Ecological Considerations | Consideration of expected project effectiveness in relation to ecological connectivity, potential effects of climate change, improvement in riparian condition and function. | Harms fish and wildlife (see *) Neutral or slightly helps Improves conditions for fish and wildlife Provides huge benefits for fish and wildlife | 0 0-2 3-6 7-10 | 10 | 6 |
| Future impacts to Habitat Conditions | Potential effects of future development and land use conversions on project values to fish/wildlife; supplementation potential for fish and wildlife. | Neutral or slightly helps Improves conditions for fish and wildlife related values Provides huge benefits for fish and wildlife related values | 0-2 3-6 7-10 | 10 | 6 |

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

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Total Unweighted Category #4 Score | 25 |
|---|-----------|

| 3. Current and Long Term Resources | | Potential Score: 20 | | | |
|--|---|---|------------|----|----------|
| Adequate Resources to Ensure Long-Term Performance of the Proposed Project | This category can be scored with a positive number if there are resources listed to support operations and maintenance and if there is a monitoring program. A zero score if not. | Operation and Maintenance Monitoring Program | 0-5 0-5 | 10 | 5 |
| Proponent's Readiness to Proceed | This category is based on the applicant's progress in designing and permitting the proposed project prior to filing an application. | Range between No Progress and Approved Construction Documents | 0-10 | 10 | 2 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Total Unweighted Category #5 Score | 7 |
|---|----------|

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Total Unweighted Score for All Categories | 49 |
|--|-----------|

| Supplementary Information | Source | | Date Obtained |
|--|------------|-------|---------------|
| | Site Visit | Other | |
| Additional information was submitted to limit the request to the SAR feasibility study | | | |

Overall Comments:

Project could be scaled if total available funds are limited. Should be combine with E-S037.

Printed Name and Title of Evaluation Member Completing This Scoring Sheet:

Combined consensus score of all evaluators

Signature: _____ Date Completed: March 25, 2009

Scoring and Weighting Table

| Categories | Maximum Possible Unweighted Score | Total Unweighted Score | Weighting Factor | Maximum Possible Weighted Score | Weighted Score |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Project Costs | 40 | 17 | 1 | 40 | 17 |
| 2. Fish/Water Quality Benefits | 40 | 25 | 1 | 40 | 25 |
| 3. Long Term Resources | 20 | 7 | 1 | 20 | 7 |
| TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES | 100 | 49 | | 100 | 49 |

Date Reviewed for Completeness: April 22, 2009 Dave Burdick, Coordinator