



Flow Achievement and Watershed Plan Implementation Grant Program

STORAGE STUDY APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Applicant PUD #1 of Jefferson County	Project Name Peterson Lake Storage and Stream Augmentation Feasibility Study
WRIA 17 – Quilcene-Snow	County Jefferson
Application Number SW – S012	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? Is there enough water for a storage project? Can water rights be obtained? Would stored water be protected from withdrawal or have impact on existing wells? Does the Aquifer have sufficient storage?	Degree of shortage Water availability Certainty of water rights Impact on other wells Storage capability	0-5 0-10 0-5 0-5 0-5	30	4 2 3 2 3
Total Unweighted Category #1 Score					14

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 Medium function and value High function and value	0-3 4-7 8-10	10	7
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 Water quality improvements	0-5 0-5	10	6

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	4
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	4

* 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	21
---	-----------

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	6
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	4

Total Unweighted Category #5 Score	10
---	-----------

Total Unweighted Score for All Categories	45
--	-----------

Supplementary Information	Source		Date Obtained
	Site Visit	Other	

Overall Comments:

There may be limited water available for storage in the basin.

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	14	1	40	14
2. Fish/Water Quality Benefits	40	21	1	40	21
3. Long Term Resources	20	10	1	20	10
TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES	100	45		100	45

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