

Weber Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1744
Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
PT/UDWR	APEA - 1.4.1.1	I understand that the relicensing process is a federal process overseen by FERC. Therefore, the FWS is the federal agency charged with being involved in this process with regard to wildlife. I just don't know if the statement "...FWS...has jurisdiction over relevant fish species in the Weber River." is accurate. They would have jurisdiction over T&E species, while the State of Utah would have jurisdiction over non T&E. Maybe this statement just needs to be clarified that it is referring to the FERC relicensing process?	Taking directly from the Federal Power Act language the key word here is 'relevant'. As you correctly state, there are no federally listed T&E) fish species (i.e., relevant species) present at this project so jurisdiction falls to the State of Utah. This clarification (in the parenthetical statement) to the APEA was made: "In this relicensing, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), as the designee of the Secretary of Interior, has jurisdiction over relevant fish species in the Weber River (in this case, relevant means federally-listed Threatened or Endangered species; UDWR has jurisdiction over non-listed wildlife of the state)."
PT/UDWR	APEA - 2.2.4.1 Fish Ladder Construction	Please include a sentence stating that PacifiCorp will work with the USFS and UDWR on public outreach explaining the 9 month recreation site closure while the fish ladder is being installed.	After the third from last sentence in this paragraph, the following sentence was added: "PacifiCorp would support the USFS and UDWR in the public outreach process explaining the nine-month recreation site closure while the fish ladder is being installed."
PT/UDWR	APEA - 3.3.3.1 Paragraph below Figure 20	Information obtained during 2017 indicates that the fish ladder that was installed on Strawberry Creek in 2016 indeed does pass fluvial BCT and even smaller BCT. This can be cited as Paul Thompson, personal communication until an annual report is finalized with this information in 2018.	The second to last sentence in this paragraph will be rewritten to say: "Those on Strawberry and Gordon creeks have been impassable (Budy et al. 2014). However the fish ladders that were installed on Strawberry Creek and Gordon Creek in 2016 do pass fluvial Bonneville cutthroat trout and smaller age classes of Bonneville cutthroat trout plus some resident cutthroat (Pers.

*Weber Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1744
Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application*

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
			Comm. 2017 - Paul Thompson, UDWR.)”
PT/UDWR	APEA - 3.3.3.1 Bluehead Sucker Paragraph 5-7	I would like to work with the authors to tighten up the information presented in these paragraphs further. For example, the UDWR has bluehead sucker population data for several reaches above the project area and downstream from Echo Dam. The USU study final report will be available before the end of calendar year 2017 and may be referenced in paragraph 6. Paragraph 7 talks about limited bluehead sucker movements between Echo and Rockport reservoirs – these movements are most likely restricted because of cold water temperatures released from Rockport Dam. The UDWR has documented much larger bluehead sucker movements above and below the project area with some movements of >7 miles near the time of spawning in the Morgan/Henefer reach.	Per conversation with UDWR, PacifiCorp made several changes to the indicated paragraphs. These paragraphs now read as follows: P5 – “The bluehead sucker exists in the area of the Weber River occupied by the Project but also extending upstream and downstream of the Project (Webber, et al. 2012). Bluehead sucker populations are managed by UDWR between Echo Reservoir and the confluence with the Ogden River. The populations in the lower river (Project Area and downstream) appear to be the most robust (Webber et al. 2012). Generally the research conducted to date indicates that the population below the Project Area, from the canyon mouth to the Ogden River confluence, is somewhere in the hundreds and is experiencing some limited recruitment. As indicated above, bluehead suckers are known to occur upstream from the hydroelectric diversion with an estimated population between Echo Reservoir and the town of Morgan between 150 and 300 individuals. To what extent spawning and recruitment occur upstream from the Project to Echo Dam is not understood at this time. However, multiple (approximately 8) congregations of individuals displaying spawning

*Weber Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1744
Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application*

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
			<p>characteristics have been documented within the area.”</p> <p>P6 – “Current efforts by USU researchers have been directed at identifying spawning areas in the lower section of the Weber River (i.e., below the canyon mouth) during late spring and quantifying habitat in these spawning reaches to assess what factors may limit recruitment. Researchers have also determined numbers of young-of-year bluehead suckers in low velocity habitats in that portion of the river. Abundance was positively associated with maximum backwater depth (Budy et al. 2017). Low velocity habitats along the river margins are relatively rare in the river upstream from the Project due to much channelization, higher gradient and altered hydrology. However, the impoundment upstream from the Project diversion may provide suitable rearing habitat for bluehead suckers spawned above this reach of the river.</p> <p>P7 – “Movements of PIT-tagged bluehead suckers (all >150mm) were evaluated using a passive antenna in the section of the river between Rockport Reservoir and Echo Reservoir (both upstream of the Project Area) from September to March 2007 to 2008. The greatest movement recorded was 2.6 km upstream. Nearly all movements were <1 km (62 percent) and during September. Most detections (88 percent) occurred at</p>

*Weber Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1744
Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application*

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
			<p>night (Webber et al. 2012). These movements are likely shortened due to thermal restrictions in habitat as the upper half of the 12 miles within this reach are likely too cold to provide adequate bluehead sucker habitat due to the bottom release dam at Rockport Reservoir. There are not any known formal studies directed towards movements of adult bluehead sucker during the spawning season (i.e., late spring and early summer) in the Weber River. However, movements are documented opportunistically through annual monitoring surveys conducted by UDWR. The section of the Weber River between the town of Morgan and Echo Dam is the least fragmented reach of the Weber River and as such has produced the most complete movement data for Weber River bluehead sucker. Within this reach bluehead sucker have been documented moving more than eight miles (more than 13.1 km) between monitoring survey years. Reaching spawning areas in the spring is the most likely explanation for this extent of bluehead sucker movement across monitoring survey years. Bluehead sucker are routinely found seven miles from their last capture site from year to year within this reach. Movements of approximately seven miles have also been documented within the timeframe of</p>

Weber Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1744
Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
			one month (both upstream and downstream).”
PT/UDWR	APEA - 3.3.3.1 Mottled Sculpin	Change steam to stream	Correction made.
PT/UDWR	APEA - 3.3.3.1 Rare, Threatened and Endangered Aquatics Species	Bluehead sucker and Bonneville cutthroat trout were referenced earlier as sensitive species by either the UDWR and/or USFS. This statement only includes a portion of the information listed earlier. The two sections/statements should present the same information.	From the paragraph titled Fish Community, the following information will be copied and will replace the last sentence under the Rare, Threatened and Endangered Aquatic Species paragraph: “The UDWR rates the Project reach of the Weber River as Class IIIB, a quality fishery with species of special concern (Bonneville cutthroat trout and bluehead sucker). Bonneville cutthroat trout is also listed as a sensitive species by the USFS.”
PT/UDWR	APEA - 3.3.3.1 Table 30	In the first Table line, 8 inch fish are referenced, but 150 mm is also provided. An 8 inch fish would be closer to 200 mm. This same error is made in the Larger-sized fish line towards the bottom of the table	In both places, 150 mm was changed to 203 mm.
KL/UDWQ	APEA - Water Quality/Table 16 (p. 53)	Biological Oxygen Demand, Nitrate as N, and Total Phosphorus as P are pollution indicators only – there are no water quality standards for these parameters. This should be noted in the table. (R317-2-14 and footnote 5)	The following table note was added to Table 16: “+BOD, Nitrate as N, and Total Phosphorus as P are pollution indicators only. There are no water quality standards for these parameters (see R317-2-14 and footnote 5).”
KL/DWQ	General	Has reviewed the exhibits and has no comments.	N/A
KC/AW	Exhibit A - Table 5, REC-9. Also described in 2.1.2.2; and Table 6, REC-9. <i>[Note that some tables/sections have been re-numbered in the DLA, since these references were made, and this and</i>	(1) We read the DLA as a commitment to provide 120 releases over a 30-year license term, 160 releases over a 40-year license term, or 200 releases over a 50-year license term, except for releases cancelled due to low demand. If initiation of releases is delayed by access approvals, the releases not provided during the approval period will be made up during the license term. This may benefit from clarification in the final license application.	(1) PacifiCorp will work with AW to clarify the language prior to filing the FLA. Although PacifiCorp’s intent is to ensure the boater flows occur once the necessary agreements are obtained, substantial delays in that process could limit the operational ability of PacifiCorp to

Weber Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1744
Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
	<p><i>following references to tables/sections in this column and column 3 refer to the preliminary DLA reviewed by stakeholders]</i></p>	<p>(2) There is an error in REC-9 that needs remedied to both <u>increase</u> and decrease the number of releases based on attendance. We agree with the statement that “boater flows in the future may be subject to minimum boater use,” however we disagree with the parenthetical comment that follows noting that “fewer than a minimum threshold of boaters may result in suspension of boater flows” because it lacks a similar mechanism to restore flows if demand rebounds. Fixing this issue will bring REC-9 into alignment with our negotiations, and ensure future generations are not deprived of public project-related outdoor recreation because of potential low demand early in the license.</p> <p>We propose that this section be amended in the FLA to state: “Boater flows in the future may be subject to minimum boater use. One annual release may be cancelled each year that the prior 3-year rolling average attendance for releases was less than 6 boaters per release. One release will be restored each year that the 3-year rolling average attendance for releases is more than 6 boaters per release. To ensure an annual test of demand, there shall be no less than one annual release. Except for additional make-up releases from delays or cancellation, there shall be no more than 4 annual releases.”</p> <p>With this said, we believe that monitoring and other costs of implementing these use triggers may exceed the cost of simply providing of 4 annual releases without monitoring. We request that the Licensee reconsider the triggers, but we agree to them as noted above if the Licensee wishes to proceed with them.</p>	<p>provide ‘makeup’ flows, depending on the number required.</p> <p>(2) Agree that if lack of demand results in a reduction of boater flows, then future monitoring (following any reduction in number of boater flows) that indicates an increase in boater use to a yet-to-be identified number of boaters per release would result in re-instatement (up to four/year) of the boater flows. We propose to work with AW to clarify the language for both these issues, and to determine what thresholds on usage are appropriate for this system. Final language will be proposed and available for stakeholder review prior to the release of the FLA.</p>

Weber Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1744
Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
KC/AW	Exhibit A- Table 6, REC-9	We assume that the \$10,000 capital cost associated with REC-9 is the estimated cost of the “items and improvements needed for safe use, such as but not limited to signage, steps for the portage area, and hazard mitigation.” agreed to therein, and would like to see that specifically mentioned. We also note that the cost of each release is estimated to be a modest \$1,000, with the note below that more than half of that cost appears to be staff related rather than related to foregone generation.	That assumption is correct; it is listed in Exhibit A of the DLA, Table 7. Comment regarding the cost is noted; no changes made to text in the DLA.
KC/AW	Exhibit A - 6 ESTIMATED CHANGE IN PROJECT GENERATION §4.61 (C)(5)	We note that each recreational release requires only 12MWh of foregone power generation (pg. 6-1). With an estimated value of \$30/MWh, each release will cost only \$360 in foregone generation. On an annual basis, recreational releases are anticipated to require 48MWh of foregone power generation (page 6-1), while the project generates on average 16,926MWh (page 2-4). Thus recreational releases will cost less than 0.3% of the project's generation.	Per Chapter 4 of the APEA, costs/MWH are currently valued at \$38.99. No changes made to text in the DLA.
KC/AW	Appendix A and Exhibit G	<p>The entire bypassed river reach, at least up to the high water mark, should be included in the Project boundary. The bypassed reach is essential for passing high project inflows and for mitigating Project effects.</p> <p>At a minimum, sufficient land must be included within the Project boundary to provide for public use of the planned recreational releases and spills, which includes a takeout upstream of the downstream diversion dam as well as a portage and re-entry point downstream of that dam.</p>	<p>The current Project Boundary in the bypassed reach includes a 50-foot corridor, centered on the flowline/penstock (see Exhibit G). The proposed Project Boundary is identical in the bypassed reach – PacifiCorp does not have the property rights from a private landowner there to acquire these rights (which would substantially increase the acreage of the entire Project Boundary), nor does it seem prudent or useful to attempt to do so. No changes made to the proposed Project Boundary.</p> <p>Once the appropriate final agreement from the parties has been obtained (see Rec-9, MOA, Appendix A to Exhibit E/APEA), PacifiCorp will work to revise the Project Boundary and associated</p>

*Weber Hydroelectric Project
 FERC No. 1744
 Comment Matrix: Preliminary Draft License Application*

Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section Title/ Paragraph #	Comment	Resolution
			Exhibit G maps to include any additional lands necessary to provide for a potential take-out and/or portage site. Revised exhibit will be submitted to FERC for approval. Until such an agreement is in place, PacifiCorp maintains it is premature to change the proposed Project Boundary.