

**Cutler Project FERC Relicensing
Situation Assessment Current Findings
June 25, 2019**

Below is a summary of current findings from situation assessment interviews conducted between February and May 2019.

1. What is your name, affiliation (if any), and title?

20 interviews, 18 via telephone, 2 responded to questions in writing via email correspondence

- 6 NGOs
- 4 State Government Agency
- 1 Municipal Government Agency
- 2 Federal Government Agency
- 3 Private Citizens
- 1 University
- 3 Business entities (non-profit or for profit)

2. What is your relationship to PacifiCorp and to the Cutler Project?

Range of relationships to PacifiCorp and to the Cutler Project – regulators, managers, landowners, general public with in an interest in how Cutler is managed for water downstream and recreation, water users, researchers.

3. How would you describe your level of knowledge about PacifiCorp’s Cutler Project?

Knowledge of the Cutler Project varies from very little “general” knowledge to highly knowledgeable.

4. How would you describe your level of knowledge about the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (FERC’s) relicensing process for hydropower facilities such as the Cutler Project?

Knowledge and understanding of the FERC relicensing process varies from “not good, this is my first time being involved” to highly knowledgeable.

5. Do you have any specific concerns about the Cutler Project? If so, can you tell me what they are?

Rate of release; mitigation projects to protect water quality; maintain continued recreational opportunity for sportsman (especially anglers); change in operations concerning storage, release, and the like; ULT; migratory birds; state sensitive or conservation agreement species; balance of interests including recreation, wildlife habitat, and agriculture; bank erosion; wetlands; expansion of the reservoir; altering flow regime of Bear River; weed management; sediment filling in the reservoir; bank erosion; impacts to irrigators and irrigators’ pumps, etc.; reservoir water quality; operations at Cutler too constrained which hinders what can be done from a management perspective; will the water stored in Cutler be part of the Bear River Development Project?; BRCC needs to maintain access to water during draw down for LIDAR; no diminishment or diversion of Bear River and GSL continues to receive adequate flows; mimic the natural seasonal water delivery cycles that would occur over the seasons.

6. In your mind what opportunities do the Cutler Project and the relicensing process present?

Restoration type work to benefit water quality and other resources; look at how the dam and releases are managed; how far downstream does the effect of Cutler extend?; enhance some facilities; better understanding of Cutler and better working relationship with PacifiCorp; need more detail on operational changes to answer question; mitigation; increased public awareness of the importance of wetlands; better avian population monitoring; improved water quality; protection of the amount and timing of flows to GSL; improve wetland health; reduce erosion; could operate flows and releases from the dam to benefit the environment (aquatic, riparian, wetland, and floodplain environment); mitigation to improve the aquatic environment via the flow regime; would like to see PacifiCorp operate the Project to more closely mimic the natural hydrological cycle to the extent possible; be transparent about how the project operates in relation to PacifiCorp's entire energy portfolio (for instance, it would be beneficial for people to understand how much energy Cutler produces in relation to their larger energy portfolio; would inform the public dialog about what we are really talking about; crucial piece of the puzzle or not?); can improvements be made that benefit irrigators?; opportunity to change the management of PacifiCorp property around the reservoir, including partnering with other organizations in that management (includes weed management, but would go beyond weeds); improve how PacifiCorp engages with stakeholders and make it more collaborative; maintain and enhance habitat; step up on noxious weed control; deal with sediment and have a long term strategy for dealing with it in the future.

7. Are you interested in collaborating with PacifiCorp and other stakeholders related to the Cutler Project and the relicensing process? If so, how does this process look to you?

Most interviewees are interested in collaborating. Many don’t necessarily have a clear idea of how this process looks to them. Some suggested processes that have been used in the past for things like the Cutler TMDL (technical advisory committee, steering committee, or the like). Multiple people indicated the importance of a facilitated process. There was at least one suggestion to make sure people who work during the day can be involved in workshops.

8. Is there anything I should know about the different entities and individuals with an interest in the Cutler Project and the FERC relicensing process?

This was a difficult question for interviewees to answer. Most said they are not aware of anything. A few provided specifics.

9. Do you have any suggestions for who should be involved in or engaged in the collaborative process associated with the Cutler Project?

Several suggestions provided by interviewees. Most are already at least on the distribution list and many were already on the interview list. Suggestions have been added to the database.