



Providing quality water, power and service at a competitive price that our customers value

June 21, 2012

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

**Re: Jackson Hydroelectric Project, FERC No. P-2157  
A-LA 12: Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan – 2011 Annual Report**

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County is filing its *Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan – 2011 Annual Report for the Jackson Hydroelectric Project*. The Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan is a condition of the Jackson Hydroelectric Project License dated September 2, 2011, under License Ordering Paragraphs D (License Appendix A, condition 5.2) and E (License Appendix B, condition 2), and identified in License Appendix G as A-LA 12: Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan. The Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan was filed with the Commission on November 19, 2010, and requires an annual report be filed with the Commission by June 30 of each year.

If you have any questions regarding the contents of the enclosed report, please do not hesitate to contact Keith Binkley (Manager Natural Resources) at [KMBinkley@snopud.com](mailto:KMBinkley@snopud.com) or (425) 783-1769.

Sincerely,



Keith Binkley for:

Kim D. Moore, P.E.  
Assistant General Manager of Generation, Water, and Corporate Services  
[KDMoore@snopud.com](mailto:KDMoore@snopud.com)  
(425) 783-8606

Enclosed: Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan – 2011 Annual Report

cc: Aquatic Resources Committee  
Keith Binkley – District

# Henry M. Jackson Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2157)



## **Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan: 2011 Annual Report**



Everett, WA

May 2012

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR 2011 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	Project Selection.....	1
2.2	Project Implementation .....	1
2.3	Project Monitoring .....	2
<b>3.0</b>	<b>ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR 2012 .....</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1	Project Selection.....	2
3.1.1	<i>Confluence Property Acquisition.....</i>	<i>2</i>
3.1.2	<i>Shinglebolt Slough Restoration.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>FUND BALANCE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>FHE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>4</b>

## APPENDICES

---

APPENDIX 1	CONSULTATION DOCUMENTATION
APPENDIX 2	RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
APPENDIX 3	UPDATED SCORECARD

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

The Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County (District) received a license on 2 September 2011 (License) from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for the Henry M. Jackson Hydroelectric Project (Project). License Ordering Paragraphs D (Washington Department of Ecology 401 Water Quality Certification conditions) and E (U.S. Forest Service section 4(e) conditions) require the District to implement Aquatic License Article 12: Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan (A-LA 12) as detailed in License Exhibit G. The District filed the Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan (FHE Plan) with the FERC on 19 November 2010.

As indicated in the FHE Plan, funded projects will be designed to provide additional Project-related enhancements to aquatic resources and hydrologic processes focused in the Sultan River basin; thereby, providing considerable benefits to Sultan River basin aquatic habitat and anadromous and resident fish populations throughout the License term. These additional habitat enhancement projects, working in conjunction with other protection, mitigation and enhancement measures such as improved side channel connectivity, increased instream flows, and the anticipated fish passage at the Diversion Dam will likely substantially increase the quantity and quality of aquatic habitat and population performance of anadromous and resident fish in the lower Sultan River. Establishment of the ongoing FHE Plan and Habitat Enhancement Account (HEA) will also allow for adaptive management as conditions change in the basin. The mitigation provided through the fund will best address habitat enhancement and restoration needs throughout the License term by allowing flexibility to ensure that these other habitat enhancement and restoration projects are developed and implemented during the License term.

Per Section 6.2 of the FHE Plan, the District is to prepare a report by 30 June of each year detailing activities that occurred the previous year and activities planned for the present year as they relate to implementation of FHE Plan-approved projects. This FHE Plan Annual Report, covering activities conducted in 2011 and planned for 2012, has been provided to the Aquatic Resources Committee (ARC) for a 30-day review and comment period. The ARC consists of the City of Everett, City of Sultan, Snohomish County, Washington Department of Ecology, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Tulalip Tribes, U.S. Forest Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and American Whitewater. Consultation documentation is included in Appendix 1.

## **2.0 ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR 2011**

---

### **2.1 Project Selection**

Due to the timing of the License issuance, FHE Plan projects were not selected during the 4Q2011 ARC meeting as contemplated in the Plan. At the fourth quarter meeting, the ARC deferred habitat project selection to the 1Q2012 ARC meeting.

### **2.2 Project Implementation**

No FHE Plan habitat projects were implemented in 2011.

## 2.3 Project Monitoring

No monitoring of FHE Plan habitat projects was conducted since no FHE-funded habitat projects were implemented in 2011.

## 3.0 ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR 2012

### 3.1 Project Selection

During the 1Q 2012 ARC meeting on 18 January, the ARC reviewed six project proposals. A follow-up meeting on 3 February occurred for further review and selection. A summary of the selection is as follows:

PROPOSAL NAME	APPROVED FUNDING	NOTES
Confluence Property Acquisition	Yes	Subject to consistency with laws and regulations applicable to the District, internal guidelines and procedures, real estate appraisal, fair market value, and any other applicable requirements.
Shinglebolt Slough Restoration	Yes	Contingent on the PUD securing property rights.
Lower Sultan River Riparian Restoration	No	Potential problems with District contracting/use of volunteer labor that was assumed in the proposal. Will re-evaluate and re-propose for next round as removal of weeds will help stop the spread further downstream.
Knotweed Control Along Side Channels at Osprey Park	No	Potential problems with District contracting/use of volunteer labor that was assumed in the proposal.
Blackberry Control Along Side Channels at Osprey Park	No	Potential problems with District contracting/use of volunteer labor that was assumed in the proposal.
Acquisition for Sunset Falls Release Site	No	Noteworthy project for the area however, it lacked project nexus.

#### 3.1.1 Confluence Property Acquisition

The primary objective of the proposed Confluence Property Acquisition project is to acquire floodplain property that supports salmonid habitat in the Braided Reach of the Skykomish River near the confluence with the Sultan River. Acquisition and subsequent restoration (as identified in section 3.1.2 below) will improve habitat quality and quantity in the mainstem and provide an opportunity to reconnect Shinglebolt Slough as side channel habitat and restore hydrologic and

riparian processes critical to salmon recovery efforts. The project supports core Chinook spawning, rearing and refugia habitat in the basin and is a priority for achieving reach-scale recovery. Acquisition is timely and necessary to prevent future degradation and ensure long-term stewardship. Ongoing land management over the term of the License would include such activities as minor dumping clean up, road access maintenance and road access control (gate). The property is currently listed for sale; however, acquisition of the property by the District is subject to consistency with laws and regulations applicable to the District, internal guidelines and procedures, real estate appraisal, fair market value, and any other applicable requirements. The ARC approved up to \$225,000 for all aspects of this project. Included in the cost are property purchase and associated closing costs, staff time, appraisal, Phase 1 environmental analysis, access control purchase and installation, and site maintenance over the 45-year License term. If the District is unable to acquire the property, the allocated funds will be returned to the HEA for use by another ARC-approved project during the next selection process.

### ***3.1.2 Shinglebolt Slough Restoration***

The Shinglebolt Slough Restoration project is contingent on the District obtaining ownership of the property as discussed above in section 3.1.1. The project objective is to restore degraded side-channel rearing length (approximately 4,000 linear feet) and capacity (1.5-2.0 acres) within the Sultan-Skykomish rivers confluence area at Shinglebolt Slough. The restoration would include enlarging the inlet opening and channel area in Shinglebolt Slough by excavation; constructing flood fencing to enhance upstream inlet opening and in-channel habitat conditions; protecting and improve left bank edge habitat in slough with riparian planting and woody debris bank treatments; and monitoring. This project would address habitat limiting factors related to channel conditions (channel type, capacity, and quality), floodplain conditions, riparian conditions, and biological processes (spawning, migration/rearing, foraging functions). Additionally, temperature benefits may result from enhanced cool water hyporheic inflow within the excavated and side channel area. The targeted area is 4,000 linear feet and 1.5-2.0 acres of Shinglebolt Slough side channel rearing area during peak Chinook salmon outmigration. The project would take approximately 5 years from the date of property acquisition, and would be managed by Snohomish County.

The ARC approved up to \$396,000 for all aspects of this project. Shinglebolt Slough Restoration costs include staff time for project management, surveys for baseline conditions, hydraulic modeling, design, permitting, construction of restoration elements, post-construction monitoring, and reporting. If the District is unable to acquire the property, the allocated funds will be returned to the habitat enhancement account for use by another ARC-approved project during the next selection process.

## **4.0 FUND BALANCE**

---

On 2 October 2011 the District deposited \$2.5 million into an interest-bearing account. The account balance as of 31 December 2011 was \$2,500,810. A reserve of \$0.5 million is set aside to potentially fund slide modifications in the Sultan River in the future. No expenditures from the account were made in 2011 since project selection did not occur until 1Q 2012. The ARC approved a total of \$621,000 to be used from the fund on 3 February 2012.

## **5.0 FHE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

At the 18 April 2012 ARC meeting, the ARC discussed process improvements and clarified the intent of project proposals. The District made recommendations for updating the scorecard to better incorporate the intent of the HEA to be used for projects with a Project nexus and improving habitat and fisheries within the Sultan River and Basin. WDFW recommended that the District send out a reminder in the summer that project proposals are due by 2 October 2012; the District agreed to email a reminder to the ARC in the July/August timeframe. The District provided the draft scorecard for a 30-day review and comment period on 18 April 2012. The Tulalip Tribes and WDFW provided comments recommending clarification to several metrics in the FHE Plan's Appendix 4 scorecard and more focused procedures for routing project proposal requests. The District's responses to comments to the draft annual report are included in Appendix 2. The updated scorecard is included in Appendix 3.

## **Appendix 1**

---

### *Consultation Documentation*



## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Jim Miller [JMiller@ci.everett.wa.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 11:48 AM  
**To:** Presler, Dawn  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review

No Comment.  
Jim Miller

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn [<mailto:DJPresler@SNOPUD.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 11:40 AM  
**To:** 'Anne Savery'; 'Okeefe@americanwhitewater.org'; Jim Miller; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review

Per our ARC meeting just now, attached is the draft scorecard for your 30-day review and comment (due by May 18).

Thanks.

*Dawn Presler*  
Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709  
\*\*\*\*\*  
PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 11:40 AM  
**To:** 'Anne Savery'; 'Okeefe@americanwhitewater.org'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review  
**Attachments:** DRAFT update proposal to score card Fish\_Habitat\_Enhancement\_Plan.DOC

Per our ARC meeting just now, attached is the draft scorecard for your 30-day review and comment (due by May 18).

Thanks.

*Dawn Presler*  
Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Leonetti, Frank [frank.leonetti@snoco.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 30, 2012 12:15 PM  
**To:** Presler, Dawn  
**Cc:** Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - draft meeting summary and reminder

Hi Dawn, I don't have any edits for the draft meeting summary material or the Project scorecard revisions (sent under other email). I'm still looking at the Fisheries and Habitat Monitoring Plan Annual Report. - Frank

Thanks – Frank

Frank Leonetti  
[frank.leonetti@snoco.org](mailto:frank.leonetti@snoco.org)  
Senior Habitat Specialist  
Snohomish County Public Works  
Surface Water Management  
3000 Rockefeller Ave., MS 607  
Everett WA 98201-4046  
Voice 425 388-3464 x4249  
FAX 425 388-6455

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn [<mailto:DJPresler@SNOPUD.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 27, 2012 12:39 PM  
**To:** 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'James (ECY) Pacheco'; 'mkan461@ecy.wa.gov'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'; Leonetti, Frank  
**Cc:** 'Steven Fransen'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; Binkley, Keith; Moore, Kim  
**Subject:** ARC - draft meeting summary and reminder

Dear ARC Members:

Attached are the draft meeting summary and presentation from our ARC meeting last week. Please review and provide edits, if any, on the draft meeting summary by May 7.

Reminder – comments on the Fisheries and Habitat Monitoring Plan Annual Report are due by May 7 as well. (The draft annual report was sent to you on April 5.)

*Dawn Presler*  
Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Anne Savery [asavery@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 01, 2012 11:51 AM  
**To:** Presler, Dawn  
**Cc:** Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** FHE Plan scorecard comments  
**Attachments:** DRAFT update proposal to score card Fish\_Habitat\_Enhancement\_Plan\_AS.doc

Dawn

Attached are my comments. Mostly asking for some definitions of terms, which may be defined somewhere else.

I checked in with Abby about the FHE process last year. The source of her issue with the process was that the call for projects was widely broadcast throughout the basin. The result was that she fielded a lot of calls and emails from groups with project ideas that may or may not have worked in the project area. She wound up spending a lot of time and effort on various project submittals with Tulalip as a sponsor - which were either submitted or not - I'm still a little unclear.

She suggests it might be a better idea to control to whom the call for projects is sent in order to get better project ideas, rather than a broadcast. Through her, I understand it wasn't you who broadcast the request for project submittals.

I'm not sure exactly how the process works in terms of frequency of requests for FHE projects. Is this a yearly thing? It seems the ARC could have ideas for projects and do a little legwork in suggesting partner entities - rather than a wide net. We should get some agreement in the ARC to figure out how to go forward on this, unless you already have plans to refine this.

Anne

Anne Savery  
Consulting Hydrologist  
Tulalip Tribes of Washington  
503-493-1999

## Appendix 4

### Evaluation Criteria Form

---

# EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM SCORE CARD

Proposed FHE Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Scored By: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Location	Type <sup>1</sup>	PM&E Nexus	Cost/Benefit (Long Term)	Sound Proposal <sup>2</sup>	Extra Credit (+)
5= Lower Sultan River	5= Significantly improves access to or quantity of high quality habitat	5= Has clear project nexus and addresses <u>salmon</u> recovery objective	5= Low cost / great benefit	5= Well thought out plan, scope, budget, time, method, benefit	
4= Upper Sultan River, Sultan Basin, Spada Lake Reservoir or its tributaries	4= Significantly enhances existing habitat	4= Addresses recovery objective	4= Moderate cost / great benefit		
3= Skykomish River ( <u>below River Mile 13.9</u> ), Snohomish River or Estuary	3= Moderately enhances existing habitat	3= Addresses <u>identified critical habitat need</u>	3= High cost/great benefit	3= Appropriate level of plan, scope, budget, time, method, benefit	3= District-owned asset
	2= Acquires land / averts development		2= Low cost/marginal benefit		2= Leveraging other grant moneys for District project ( <u>at least 25%</u> )
	1= Improves access to marginal habitat	1= Non-identified/formalized objective	1= High cost/low benefit	1= Inappropriate level of plan, scope, budget, time, method, <u>benefit</u>	
0= Upstream of Sultan River (Skykomish River <u>River Mile 13.9 or above</u> )	0= None of the above	0= No project nexus	0= No benefit	0= Does not meet intent of FHE Fund	
<b>Weighting=x5</b>	<b>Weighting=x4</b>	<b>Weighting=x3</b>	<b>Weighting=x2</b>	<b>Weighting=x1</b>	<b>Weighting=x1</b>
Maximum points=25	Maximum points=20	Maximum points=15	Maximum points=10	Maximum points=5	Maximum points=5
Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:
<b>TOTAL POINTS SCORED:</b>					

**Note:**<sup>1</sup> If multiple criteria apply to the category (such as "Acquires land" and "Significantly improves access", the **highest valued** points will be awarded.

<sup>2</sup> If another criteria applies along with "Does not meet intent of FHE Fund", then the 0 points value will be awarded.

Total maximum points = 80.

**Comment [AS1]:** How is Lower Sultan River defined? Is this below Culmback Dam, Powerhouse? It seems that fish habitat enhancements should be equally considered throughout the Project Area – or at least between upstream and downstream of Culmback Dam.

**Comment [AS4]:** Defined?

**Comment [AS2]:** Are all FHEs for salmon, or could they address resident fish habitat?

**Comment [AS3]:** Great benefit – metric could use better definition.

**Comment [AS5]:** Identified by whom?

**Comment [AS6]:** How is time measured? The amount of time the project will take?

**Comment [AS7]:** Might consider giving a '3 or 4' to 25% and a '2 or 3' to <25% - Extra Credit might even get a higher weighting if it is bringing in a significant amount of \$\$\$ - and does it have to be money? Can it be labor or in kind service?

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 11:18 AM  
**To:** 'Anne Savery'; 'Okeefe@americanwhitewater.org'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review

Dear ARC,

The 30-day comment period is over. I have received feedback from Ann, Frank and Jim. For those that haven't commented, please get me your comments by tomorrow COB if you have any. Thanks!

Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 11:40 AM  
**To:** 'Anne Savery'; 'Okeefe@americanwhitewater.org'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review

Per our ARC meeting just now, attached is the draft scorecard for your 30-day review and comment (due by May 18).

Thanks.

*Dawn Presler*

Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Applegate, Brock A (DFW) [Brock.Applegate@dfw.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2012 5:01 PM  
**To:** Presler, Dawn; 'Anne Savery'; 'Okeefe@americanwhitewater.org'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; Maynard, Chris (ECY)  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review  
**Attachments:** A-LA 12 Fish\_Habitat\_Enhancement\_Plan score card.doc

Dawn, I have two comments: 1) Acquisition of Habitat for Enhancement is undervalued or at least not clarified in the scored card “((f) land purchases related to aquatic habitat enhancement;” is called out in the settlement agreement. See attachment for revisions.

I still think the location should include upstream on the Skykomish above the confluence of the Sultan and Skykomish. Many of the same fish and wildlife populations will utilize both areas and therefore in my mind are part of the same effects area. I will not object to the current way it is written because I feel clarity in project location allows a project proponent to not waste his/her time. It seemed like the consensus did not want to include any consideration of projects above the Sultan confluence on the Skykomish or at least RM 13.9 on the Skykomish (Not sure where that is at).

Anyway, my two cents.

Sincerely, Brock

Brock Applegate  
Energy and Major Projects Mitigation Biologist  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
16018 Mill Creek Boulevard  
Mill Creek, WA 98012-1541

(425) 775-1311 x310  
(360) 789-0578 (cell)  
(425) 338-1066 (fax)

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn [<mailto:DJPresler@SNOPUD.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2012 11:18 AM  
**To:** 'Anne Savery'; 'Okeefe@americanwhitewater.org'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; Maynard, Chris (ECY); Applegate, Brock A (DFW)  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review

Dear ARC,

The 30-day comment period is over. I have received feedback from Ann, Frank and Jim. For those that haven't commented, please get me your comments by tomorrow COB if you have any. Thanks!

Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 11:40 AM  
**To:** 'Anne Savery'; 'Okeefe@americanwhitewater.org'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Deborah Knight - Sultan'; 'steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'



**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith

**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan scorecard - DRAFT for your 30-day review

Per our ARC meeting just now, attached is the draft scorecard for your 30-day review and comment (due by May 18).

Thanks.

*Dawn Presler*

Sr. Environmental Coordinator

Generation Resources

(425) 783-1709

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County

PO Box 1107

Everett, WA 98206-1107

# Appendix 4

## Evaluation Criteria Form

---

# EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM

## SCORE CARD

Proposed FHE Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Scored By: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Location	Type <sup>1</sup>	PM&E Nexus	Cost/Benefit (Long Term)	Sound Proposal <sup>2</sup>	Extra Credit (+)
5= Lower Sultan River	5= Significantly <u>protects or improves access to or quantity of high quality habitat</u>	5= Has clear project nexus and addresses salmon recovery objective	5= Low cost / great benefit	5= Well thought out plan, scope, budget, time, method, benefit	
4= Upper Sultan River, Sultan Basin, Spada Lake Reservoir or its tributaries	4= Significantly <u>protects or enhances existing habitat</u>	4= Addresses recovery objective	4= Moderate cost / great benefit		
3= Skykomish River ( <u>below River Mile 13.9</u> ), Snohomish River or Estuary	3= Moderately <u>enhances or protects existing habitat</u>	3= Addresses identified critical habitat need	3= High cost/great benefit	3= Appropriate level of plan, scope, budget, time, method, benefit	3= District-owned asset
	2= <u>Acquires land / averts development</u>		2= Low cost/marginal benefit		2= Leveraging other grant moneys for District project (at least 25%)
	1= Improves access to marginal habitat	1= Non-identified/formalized objective	1= High cost/low benefit	1= Inappropriate level of plan, scope, budget, time, method, <u>benefit</u>	
0= <u>Upstream of Sultan River (Skykomish River River Mile 13.9 or above)</u>	0= <u>None of the above</u>	0= <u>No project nexus</u>	0= <u>No benefit</u>	0= <u>Does not meet intent of FHE Fund</u>	
<b>Weighting=x5</b>	<b>Weighting=x4</b>	<b>Weighting=x3</b>	<b>Weighting=x2</b>	<b>Weighting=x1</b>	<b>Weighting=x1</b>
Maximum points=25	Maximum points=20	Maximum points=15	Maximum points=10	Maximum points=5	Maximum points=5
Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:
<b>TOTAL POINTS SCORED:</b>					

**Note:**<sup>1</sup> If multiple criteria apply to the category (such as "Acquires land" and "Significantly improves access", the **highest valued** points will be awarded.

<sup>2</sup> If another criteria applies along with "Does not meet intent of FHE Fund", then the 0 points value will be awarded.

Total maximum points = 80.

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 24, 2012 9:35 PM  
**To:** 'Steven Fransen'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Spahr, Scott; Binkley, Keith; Chrisman, Barry  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review  
**Attachments:** 2011 FHEP Annual Report.docx

Dear ARC,

Attached is the draft Annual Report for the Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan. You've already commented on the score card portion (it's been updated based on WDFW and Tulalip comments and included as Appendix 3). I'm requesting comments on the draft report **by June 15** so I can file it with the FERC before my vacation in the later half of June. If you need the full 30-day review period, please let me know and I'll work with Keith on making that happen. If you have no comments on the draft report, a quick email stating so would be appreciated.

Thanks! Happy Memorial Day weekend!

*Dawn Presler*  
Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709  
\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Leonetti, Frank [frank.leonetti@snoco.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 29, 2012 12:56 PM  
**To:** Presler, Dawn  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

Hi Dawn, Ill get any comments to you before June 15. Thanks - Frank

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn [<mailto:DJPresler@SNOPUD.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 24, 2012 9:35 PM  
**To:** 'Steven Fransen'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; Leonetti, Frank; 'mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Spahr, Scott; Binkley, Keith; Chrisman, Barry  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

Dear ARC,

Attached is the draft Annual Report for the Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan. You've already commented on the score card portion (it's been updated based on WDFW and Tulalip comments and included as Appendix 3). I'm requesting comments on the draft report **by June 15** so I can file it with the FERC before my vacation in the later half of June. If you need the full 30-day review period, please let me know and I'll work with Keith on making that happen. If you have no comments on the draft report, a quick email stating so would be appreciated.

Thanks! Happy Memorial Day weekend!

*Dawn Presler*

Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709  
\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 29, 2012 4:00 PM  
**To:** Binkley, Keith  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim  
**Subject:** Sultan - FHE Plan score card comment

FYI...

Deborah Knight left me a message last Wednesday to call her about comments on the FHE Plan score card. I talked to her today and her comments were that:

1. She would like to see fewer "low level maintenance requests" (such as the noxious weed cleanups) routed for approval/score less on the score card. She'd like to see the funds get used for bigger bang for the buck. We discussed that you further defined the Cost/Benefit column per Savery's request. She understood that the form is still subjective and hard to capture all the criteria concisely in one page.
2. She would like me to resend the list of potential projects that were discussed during Settlement discussions, since these seemed to be bigger ticket items with better bang for the buck. I told her I thought I passed this out at our October 2011 meeting, but would resend it out along with the reminder notice in July/August as it would be a good refresher for ideas.

Her last day with the City of Sultan is this Friday.

*Dawn Presler*

Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2012 8:27 AM  
**To:** 'Steven Fransen'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

Dear ARC,

Reminder – comments are due today on the draft FHE Plan Annual Report. No one requested a longer review period – thank you. So, please get your comments in (or “no comments” email) by end of day today. I will e-file the report with the FERC, early next week before I leave for Oregon.

Enjoy this sunny Friday!

Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 24, 2012 9:35 PM  
**To:** 'Steven Fransen'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Spahr, Scott; Binkley, Keith; Chrisman, Barry  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

Dear ARC,

Attached is the draft Annual Report for the Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan. You've already commented on the score card portion (it's been updated based on WDFW and Tulalip comments and included as Appendix 3). I'm requesting comments on the draft report **by June 15** so I can file it with the FERC before my vacation in the later half of June. If you need the full 30-day review period, please let me know and I'll work with Keith on making that happen. If you have no comments on the draft report, a quick email stating so would be appreciated.

Thanks! Happy Memorial Day weekend!

*Dawn Presler*

Sr. Environmental Coordinator  
Generation Resources  
(425) 783-1709

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County  
PO Box 1107  
Everett, WA 98206-1107

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Applegate, Brock A (DFW) [Brock.Applegate@dfw.wa.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2012 11:24 AM  
**To:** Presler, Dawn  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - A-LA 12 Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan Annual Report - for your review  
**Attachments:** A-LA 12 2011 Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan Annual Report.docx

Hi Dawn, It seems the last project in the list was opposed because of project location, not PM &E nexus. I would think the ability to have a salmonid release site after trucking them around fish barriers would be a good PM&E measure for a dam. See attached.

Sincerely, Brock

Brock Applegate  
Energy and Major Projects Mitigation Biologist  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
16018 Mill Creek Boulevard  
Mill Creek, WA 98012-1541

(425) 775-1311 x310  
(360) 789-0578 (cell)  
(425) 338-1066 (fax)

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn [<mailto:DJPresler@SNOPUD.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2012 8:27 AM  
**To:** 'Steven Fransen'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; Maynard, Chris (ECY); Applegate, Brock A (DFW)  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Binkley, Keith  
**Subject:** RE: ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

Dear ARC,  
Reminder – comments are due today on the draft FHE Plan Annual Report. No one requested a longer review period – thank you. So, please get your comments in (or “no comments” email) by end of day today. I will e-file the report with the FERC, early next week before I leave for Oregon.

Enjoy this sunny Friday!

Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 24, 2012 9:35 PM  
**To:** 'Steven Fransen'; 'tim\_romanski@fws.gov'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; 'mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; 'brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Spahr, Scott; Binkley, Keith; Chrisman, Barry  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

Dear ARC,  
Attached is the draft Annual Report for the Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan. You've already commented on the score card portion (it's been updated based on WDFW and Tulalip comments and included as Appendix 3). I'm requesting comments on the draft report **by June 15** so I can file it with the FERC before my vacation in the later half of June. If you need the full 30-day review period, please let me know and I'll work with Keith on making that happen. If you have no comments on the draft report, a quick email stating so would be appreciated.



Thanks! Happy Memorial Day weekend!

*Dawn Presler*

Sr. Environmental Coordinator

Generation Resources

(425) 783-1709

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD No. 1 of Snohomish County

PO Box 1107

Everett, WA 98206-1107

## 2.3 Project Monitoring

No monitoring of FHE Plan habitat projects was conducted since no FHE-funded habitat projects were implemented in 2011.

## 3.0 ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR 2012

### 3.1 Project Selection

During the 1Q 2012 ARC meeting on 18 January, the ARC reviewed six project proposals. A follow-up meeting on 3 February occurred for further review and selection. A summary of the selection is as follows:

PROPOSAL NAME	APPROVED FUNDING	NOTES
Confluence Property Acquisition	Yes	Subject to consistency with laws and regulations applicable to the District, internal guidelines and procedures, real estate appraisal, fair market value, and any other applicable requirements.
Shinglebolt Slough Restoration	Yes	Contingent on the PUD securing property rights.
Lower Sultan River Riparian Restoration	No	Potential problems with District contracting/use of volunteer labor that was assumed in the proposal. Will re-evaluate and re-propose for next round as removal of weeds will help stop the spread further downstream.
Knotweed Control Along Side Channels at Osprey Park	No	Potential problems with District contracting/use of volunteer labor that was assumed in the proposal.
Blackberry Control Along Side Channels at Osprey Park	No	Potential problems with District contracting/use of volunteer labor that was assumed in the proposal.
Acquisition for Sunset Falls Release Site	No	Noteworthy project for the area however, <u>land located too far away from the hydroelectric project, lacked project nexus.</u>

#### 3.1.1 Confluence Property Acquisition

The primary objective of the proposed Confluence Property Acquisition project is to acquire floodplain property that supports salmonid habitat in the Braided Reach of the Skykomish River near the confluence with the Sultan River. Acquisition and subsequent restoration (as identified

## Presler, Dawn

---

**From:** Steven Fransen [steven.m.fransen@noaa.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 18, 2012 8:50 AM  
**To:** Presler, Dawn  
**Subject:** Re: ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

I was out on Friday Dawn, but no comments. Have a nice trip in Oregon. I hope they have a summer there this summer, unlike WA apparently.

SF

On Fri, Jun 15, 2012 at 8:27 AM, Presler, Dawn <[DJPresler@snopud.com](mailto:DJPresler@snopud.com)> wrote:

Dear ARC,

Reminder – comments are due today on the draft FHE Plan Annual Report. No one requested a longer review period – thank you. So, please get your comments in (or “no comments” email) by end of day today. I will e-file the report with the FERC, early next week before I leave for Oregon.

Enjoy this sunny Friday!

Dawn

---

**From:** Presler, Dawn  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 24, 2012 9:35 PM  
**To:** 'Steven Fransen'; '[tim\\_romanski@fws.gov](mailto:tim_romanski@fws.gov)'; 'Anne Savery'; 'Loren Everest - USFS'; 'Leonetti, Frank'; '[mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us](mailto:mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us)'; 'Jim Miller'; 'Thomas O'Keefe'; 'Maynard, Chris (ECY)'; '[brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:brock.applegate@dfw.wa.gov)'  
**Cc:** Moore, Kim; Spahr, Scott; Binkley, Keith; Chrisman, Barry  
**Subject:** ARC - FHE Plan Annual Report - for your review

Dear ARC,

Attached is the draft Annual Report for the Fish Habitat Enhancement Plan. You've already commented on the score card portion (it's been updated based on WDFW and Tulalip comments and included as Appendix 3).

I'm requesting comments on the draft report **by June 15** so I can file it with the FERC before my vacation in the later half of June. If you need the full 30-day review period, please let me know and I'll work with Keith on making that happen. If you have no comments on the draft report, a quick email stating so would be appreciated.

## **Appendix 2**

---

### *Response to Comments*

ARC Comment	PUD Response
<p><b>WDFW, 4/18/2012 at ARC Meeting:</b> Send a request for proposals to the ARC in summer as a reminder to look into potential projects for FHE proposals.</p>	<p>The District will email a reminder in July/August to ARC members, along with a copy of the FHE Plan as the Plan provides good insight and parameters for proposal ideas.</p>
<p><b>Tulalip Tribes, 5/1/2012 email:</b> ...call for projects was widely broadcast throughout the basin. The result was that she fielded a lot of calls and emails from groups with project ideas that may or may not have worked in the project area. ... might be a better idea to control to whom the call for projects is sent in order to get better project ideas, rather than a broadcast.</p>	<p>The District agrees. The intent of the proposals were to have the ARC members – people knowledgeable of the Project – submit proposals based on an identified need, using the parameters set-forth in the FHE Plan. Section 3 of the FHE Plan identifies the process. A reminder to not broadcast to outside organizations will be provided in the July/August reminder email identified above.</p>
<p><b>Tulalip Tribes, 5/1/2012 score card edits:</b> See attached.</p>	<p>Clarified when possible. There is always going to be an inherent opportunity for subjectivity when scoring the proposals. The scorecard is to provide general guidance for scoring a proposal, since ultimately any ARC member can reject a proposal regardless of score.</p>
<p><b>WDFW, 5/22/2012 email:</b> 1) Acquisition of Habitat for Enhancement is undervalued or at least not clarified in the scored card “((f) land purchases related to aquatic habitat enhancement;” is called out in the settlement agreement. See attachment for revisions.</p>	<p>Updated scorecard footnote. As now noted, if property is acquired for habitat enhancement, then the higher score should be awarded.</p>
<p><b>WDFW, 5/22/2012 email:</b> I still think the location should include upstream on the Skykomish above the confluence of the Sultan and Skykomish. Many of the same fish and wildlife populations will utilize both areas and therefore in my mind are part of the same effects area. I will not object to the current way it is written because I feel clarity in project location allows a project proponent to not waste his/her time. It seemed like the consensus did not want to include any consideration of projects above the Sultan confluence on the Skykomish or at least RM 13.9 on the Skykomish (Not sure where that is at).</p>	<p>As noted by several ARC members at the February 2012 selection meeting, habitat improvements upstream of the confluence with the Sultan River has very little nexus with the Project. Monies from this account are not to provide general habitat enhancements in the area, but to provide habitat benefits to the fishery of the Sultan River and Basin, and have a project nexus.</p>

<b>WDFW, 5/22/2012 score card edits:</b> See various edits to score card.	Added as suggested.
<b>City of Sultan, 5/29/2012 phone call:</b> would like to see fewer “low level maintenance requests” (such as the noxious weed cleanups) routed for approval/score less on the score card. Like to see the funds get used for bigger bang for the buck.	Updated scorecard per Tulalip Tribes comments. Goal of the selection process was to keep it simple and subjectivity will always be a part of the scoring; thus, it is hard to capture all criteria concisely. An entity always has the option of voting “no” for a project, regardless of the score.
<b>City of Sultan, 5/29/2012 phone call:</b> Would like to see the list of potential projects that were discussed during Settlement discussions routed to the ARC when there’s a call for proposals, since these seemed to be bigger ticket items with better bang for the buck.	The District will email the list in July/August, along with the reminder identified above, to ARC members, as the list provides good proposal ideas.
<b>WDFW, 6/51/2012 email:</b> It seems the last project in the list was opposed because of project location, not PM&E nexus. I would think the ability to have a salmonid release site after trucking them around fish barriers would be a good PM&E measure for a dam. See attached.	No change was made since the text from that table was copied from the February 2, 2012 ARC meeting summary as written and approved. As noted in the table, the ARC felt it was a worthy project but lacked Jackson Project nexus. Therefore it was not approved as part of the Jackson FHE Plan funded proposals.

## **Appendix 3**

---

*Updated Scorecard (FHE Plan Appendix 4)*

# Appendix 4

## Evaluation Criteria Form

---



## EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM SCORECARD

Proposed FHE Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Scored By: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Location	Type <sup>1</sup>	PM&E Nexus	Cost/Benefit (Long Term)	Sound Proposal <sup>2</sup>	Extra Credit (+)
5= Lower Sultan River (downstream of Culmback Dam)	5= Significantly protects or improves access to or quantity of high quality habitat	5= Has clear project nexus and addresses objectives of increased resilience and recovery of anadromous or resident salmonid populations	5= Low cost / significant benefit in terms of habitat and/or projected population response	5= Well thought out plan, scope, budget, timeframe, method, benefit. Fully meets the requirements of proposal submission.	
4= Upper Sultan River basin upstream of Culmback Dam including Spada Lake Reservoir or its tributaries	4= Significantly protects or enhances existing habitat	4= addresses objectives of increased resilience and recovery of anadromous or resident salmonid populations	4= Moderate cost / significant benefit in terms of habitat and/or projected population response		
3= Skykomish River (below River Mile 13.9), Snohomish River or Estuary	3= Moderately protects or enhances existing habitat	3= addresses specific critical habitat need identified in a species or ecosystem recovery plan	3= High cost/significant benefit in terms of habitat and/or projected population response	3= Appropriate level of plan, scope, budget, timeframe, method, benefit	3= District-owned asset
	2= Acquires land / forestalls or averts development		2= Low cost/marginal benefit in terms of habitat and/or projected population response		2= Leveraging other grant moneys for District project (at least 25%)
	1= Improves access to marginal habitat	1= Non-identified/formalized objective	1= High cost/low benefit in terms of habitat and/or projected population response	1= Inappropriate level of plan, scope, budget, timeframe, method, benefit	1= Leveraging other grant moneys for District project (less than 25%)
0= Upstream of Sultan River (Skykomish River River Mile 13.9 or above)	0= None of the above	0= No project nexus	0= No benefit	0= Does not meet intent of FHE Fund	
<b>Weighting=x5</b>	<b>Weighting=x4</b>	<b>Weighting=x3</b>	<b>Weighting=x2</b>	<b>Weighting=x1</b>	<b>Weighting=x1</b>
<i>Maximum points=25</i>	<i>Maximum points=20</i>	<i>Maximum points=15</i>	<i>Maximum points=10</i>	<i>Maximum points=5</i>	<i>Maximum points=5</i>
Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:	Points Scored:
<b>TOTAL POINTS SCORED:</b>					

<sup>1</sup> If multiple criteria apply to the category (such as "Acquires land" and "Significantly improves access", the **highest valued** points will be awarded.

<sup>2</sup> If another criteria applies along with "Does not meet intent of FHE Fund", then the 0 points value will be awarded.

Total maximum points = 80.