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## Columbia River Basin Water Management Program
### 2007-2008 Competitive Grant Cycle

#### Breakdown of Projects Proposed for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Feasibility Studies (Dollars)</th>
<th>Construction Projects (Dollars)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Water Saved or Stored in All Projects (Dollars)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Water Saved or Stored as Affected by Grant (Dollars)</th>
<th>Percent of Project Funded Through Columbia River *</th>
<th>Net Water Savings Available for New Permits (Dollars)</th>
<th>Conservation (Dollars)</th>
<th>Storage (Dollars)</th>
<th>In-Stream Benefits</th>
<th>Out-of-Stream Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banister Ranch</td>
<td>5,560,000</td>
<td>6,436</td>
<td>6,436</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>5,560,000</td>
<td>High Yielding River fish and water quality benefits.</td>
<td>High out-of-stream benefits through increased reliability of infrastructure for applicant. Permissible water is low, on the order of 5% or less based on evaporation from open canal compared to size.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln CD FS</td>
<td>925,000</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>925,000</td>
<td>Low Columbia River fish benefit, high Yielding River fish and water quality benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster CD Surface FS</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>Medium Columbia River fish benefit, high Yielding River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens PUD (Will Car)</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Low Will Car, Columbia River, Columbia River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Lake FS</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>High Photobio, Snake, Columbia River benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hittites (Manastash CR)</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>Medium Manastash benefit, low Columbia River benefits, good temperature benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse ARB</td>
<td>5,560,000</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>High Manastash Creek benefit, leverages previous investments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintz Council FS</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Medium to high fish benefit in 2007, depending in location and storm water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salmon ARB</td>
<td>955,000</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>955,000</td>
<td>Low fish benefits in Columbia River, high Yielding River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Creek FB</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>High Cold Creek, Wawawai Creek, Columbia River benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin WAM FS</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>394,000</td>
<td>394,000</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>Low Columbia River fish benefit, basing large amount potential could be reduced need for new large storage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,054,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,044,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,044,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>109%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,054,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>High Manastash benefit, leverages previous investments.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ecology CHR Project Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Feasibility Studies (Dollars)</th>
<th>Construction Projects (Dollars)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Water Saved or Stored in All Projects (Dollars)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Water Saved or Stored as Affected by Grant (Dollars)</th>
<th>Percent of Project Funded Through Columbia River *</th>
<th>Net Water Savings Available for New Permits (Dollars)</th>
<th>Conservation (Dollars)</th>
<th>Storage (Dollars)</th>
<th>In-Stream Benefits</th>
<th>Out-of-Stream Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celilo C&amp;I FS</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>4,755,000</td>
<td>4,755,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>Low fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikida Site-Beaver Meadow</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>Medium fish benefit, high Yielding River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCU ARB FS</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>Low fish benefit, high Yielding River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD Puma Exchange</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>High Yielding River fish benefit, high out-of-stream reliability benefit for Portland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitts Dam &amp; Upper Canal</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Low Columbia River fish benefit, high Yielding River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topkay Irrigation</td>
<td>1,231,000</td>
<td>1,231,000</td>
<td>1,231,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,231,000</td>
<td>Low Columbia River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odealsa EIS &amp; Design</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,085,000</td>
<td>Low Columbia River fish benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOR-Cavo, Implementable TDB</td>
<td>TDB</td>
<td>TDB</td>
<td>TDB</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** | **53,615,750** | **53,764,018** | **53,764,018** | **100%** | **0** | **53,615,750** | **High out-of-stream reliability benefit for Columbia Basin irrigation districts and assists in implementation efforts strategy for Oregon.** |

**Totals** | **53,615,750** | **53,764,018** | **53,764,018** | **100%** | **0** | **53,615,750** | **High out-of-stream reliability benefit for Columbia Basin irrigation districts and assists in implementation efforts strategy for Oregon.** |

**Total Funded Projects** | **346,409,700** | **40,490,700** | **40,490,700** | **100%** | **0** | **346,409,700** | **High out-of-stream reliability benefit for Columbia Basin irrigation districts and assists in implementation efforts strategy for Oregon.** |

**Green = Known Amounts**

---

* Water savings for feasibility studies are based on projected water savings figures. Part of the feasibility study will involve a more accurate determination of the actual rate of water savings. Savings shown are based on the portion corresponding to the States Exchange for Columbia River funding.

---

* Net water savings available for new permits will be known with certainty after construction. Feasibility studies offer potential for permissible water, should the project prove viable, and if the project is constructed.

---

* Figures based on the amount of Columbia River funding requested by the applicant minus funding from other sources required by the applicant.
$200M Columbia River Program

Note 1: Other projects funded from the $16 Million State Building Construction Account under previous Columbia River Initiative include: PBI, Mainstem Storage Alternatives Study, Walla Walla Pump Exchange, Netting, Odessa, Supplemental Feed House, Lake Roosevelt SEIS, Crab Creek SEIS, Frenchman Hills Construction, Yakama Storage Study, Fish & Wildlife Project Support

Note 2: Projects funded from the $2M Operating Budget include: Climate Change Study, Legislative Report Forecasting, Conservation Commission

Note 3: Ecology is currently reviewing the allocation of contract costs between the storage and non-storage portions of the Columbia River Account. Allocations subject to change.
1. Project Cost
   - percentage of matching funds
   - total cost per ac-ft
   - total cost per ac-ft consumptive

2. Water Savings
   - total water in storage or trust
   - percent of tributary inflow
   - water delivered to Columbia/Snake

3. Project Support
   - consistency with local plans
   - local / regional support

4. Fish/Water Quality Benefits
   - current instream species & status
   - current instream habitat conditions
   - terrestrial species, habitat conditions & potential
   - potential future water quantity / quality conditions
   - ecological considerations
   - social & human aspects

5. Resources/Readiness
   - resources committed to project
   - readiness to proceed

---

Scoring Factors and Technical Evaluation

---

Results

- Project Score
- List of Proposed Projects
- List of Water Rights
- Project Score
- List of Proposed Projects
- Project Score
- List of Proposed Projects
- Project Score
- List of Proposed Projects

---

Annual Ecology Analysis to Match Supply With Demand

- Consideration of the ability of high-scoring projects to deliver water where and when it is needed
  - supply/demand considerations
  - permanent sources matched to permanent uses
  - temporary sources matched to interruptibles/short-term demand
  - WRRA considerations

Ecology prepares a list of proposed priority projects for funding

County Commissioners' Forum Input and Policy Advisory Group Input

Ecology Budgeting Process

Governor's Budgeting Process

Legislative Funding and Approval Process

Final Approved Project List for Funding by Ecology

---

1 Ecology's intent is to move towards a sustainable and predictable funding cycle like PWT, CDGB, DWSRF and other programs. This goal will be balanced with funding for Ecology's existing commitments and the potential need to act quickly to find emerging projects that are consistent with the legislation.

2 The intent of the pre-application process and water right review is to evaluate whether a valid water right likely exists for the project. It is not a tentative determination of the extent and validity of a water right. However, Ecology will use many of the same tools that it uses when preparing a Report of Examination for a water right transfer, including a site examination and evaluation of historic beneficial use. This process is similar to that used in Ecology's Irrigation Efficiency Program.

3 "Small storage" will be determined annually by Ecology depending on factors like the size of project and the need for the feasibility study (e.g. local vs. federal).

4 Ecology's initial acquisition efforts will likely focus on specific auctions and partnerships with other programs and groups. Columbia River "acquisition" is defined in Chapter 6 of the PEIS.

5 A project may not meet minimum screening criteria because the water is not "trustable" (e.g. based on a claim), because a project is not consistent with an adopted watershed plan, because of uncertainty about whether a relinquishment exemption exists to excuse nonuse, because a change application for the water right may be needed, because a new water right may be needed, or others.

6 Plans include watershed plans / early implementation measures, salmon recovery plans and others.
Agree that leveraging CD staff is a good way to move conservation projects forward.

Current funding proposals for 2008 grant cycle doesn’t have much permitted water.

Previous PAG comments identified:
- Support for piloting the Commission’s proposal
- Support for projects that benefit fish and out-of-stream uses

The Franklin County CD IWM study is a CSRIA pilot with similar goals.

Ecology plans to set aside $1 million in grant funding for the Commission to use to encourage projects that meet both instream and out-of-stream bill objectives.

Funding could be phased to build on the Franklin CD study.

Ecology will revisit the larger Commission proposal depending on the success of the pilot.